

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s., with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d.; half law calf, 4s. 6d.

All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MARCH 28, 1868.

IN THIS WEEK'S ISSUE of the *Weekly Reporter* will be found a report of Vice-Chancellor Malins' very important decision in *Re Overend, Gurney, & Co., Ex parte Swan*. The decision is one of great importance upon the law of bills of exchange, the Vice-Chancellor having held that a person taking up a bill *supra* protest, "for honour," may sue the acceptor, though the bill was an accommodation bill as between the acceptor and drawer. The Vice-Chancellor held that the old case of *Ex parte Lambert*, 13 Ves. 179, had been virtually overruled by *Charles v. Marsden*, 1 Taunt. 224; *Sturtevant v. Ford*, 4 M. & G. 101; *Stein v. Iglesias*, 1 C.M. & R., and other cases, and expressed some surprise that *Ex parte Lambert* should continue cited in the text books to the extent to which it is there relied upon. It is understood to be the intention of the parties to carry the case up to the highest Court of Appeal.

IN ILLUSTRATION OF OUR REMARKS on the short time given for the Assizes held at the various towns on the Western Circuit, we note that at Taunton the services of Mr. Kingdon, Q.C., were required for three whole days and those of Mr. Prideaux, Q.C., for one day, in order to dispose of the ninety-one prisoners who were for trial. Under great pressure, and with four Courts sitting at once, all the cases were disposed of late on the last day. The majority of the cases might conveniently have been tried at sessions, were the option given to magistrates, as we have before suggested, to commit prisoners for trial to the next Quarter Sessions, although there might be an intermediate Assize. Of the ninety-one charges thirty-eight were petty larcenies, and the majority of the remainder of the most trifling character. At Devizes there are forty-nine cases to be tried in two days. One prisoner is to be tried by one of her Majesty's judges learned in the law, for stealing three eggs value two-pence.

THE BUSINESS on the Home Circuit does not appear at present to have been greatly affected by the new County Courts Act. The whole number of causes entered has been perhaps somewhat below the average, but the number of contested causes has been at least as large as usual. At Hertford there were only three causes entered, and these of small importance, and although this is less than usual there is scarcely ever more than a whole day's work in civil business in the county. At Chelmsford the number entered was 13, which is not far from the usual number, but here there was quite the usual proportion of undefended causes, and the thirteen were disposed of in two days, which is rather under the usual time. At Maidstone there were 18 causes entered, this, perhaps, was rather less than the average, which is about 20, but here there was only one undefended cause, and the remaining 17, though not including any case which took more than a day, were so far contested that even with the assistance of a Queen's Counsel sitting as Commissioner, they were not all disposed of in the five clear working

days allowed, but either one or two were made remanets. At Lewes there were 9 causes entered, two of which were undefended, while the remaining seven took three days to try. This was about an average entry in number, but the time occupied was rather longer than usual, showing, apparently, that the causes were more substantial ones. At Kingston the total entry is 86. This, we believe, is less than the entry of last year, but about equal to those of several preceding years. Latterly, however, there have always been a very large number of undefended causes, comprising the cases too late for the Middlesex and London sittings, and in which it was desired to obtain a judgment as early as possible. On the first day of the assizes there were comparatively few of these, and although, of course, it is impossible for anyone to say with certainty till its conclusion whether the total business of the assize will prove above or below the average, the general opinion appears to be that it will be equal to the average. There do not appear to be many long or particularly important cases, but the majority are real causes in which there is some question to try, which has often been found to be the case only in a very small proportion of those entered.

ACCORDING to the statute law as provided by 28 & 29 Vict. c. 60, s. 1, in case of sheep or cattle being injured by a dog, the sheep-owner may recover damages from the dog-owner without showing "a previous mischievous propensity, or the owner's knowledge of such propensity, or that the injury was attributable to neglect on the part of such owner." The matter then simply is that if somebody's dog bites my sheep, I can recover damages, but if the dog bites me I recover nothing unless I can prove a "*scienter*."—It is difficult to conjecture upon what principle this distinction between human flesh and mutton is grounded.

Mr. Pitt Taylor, the judge of the Lambeth County Court, had occasion this week to remark upon this ridiculous anomaly. A workman passing a house with a sack, a dog ran out of the house and bit him, whereupon he sued the owner of the dog on account of the injury he sustained. The plaintiff not being prepared with any evidence to prove a *scienter*, the judge was about to dismiss the summons, when the plaintiff fortunately supplied the link, by stating that the defendant had informed him that his dog had once been ill-treated by a sweep, since which he had always flown at sweeps, and he supposed that he might have mistaken the plaintiff for a sweep.

THE DUKE OF RICHMOND'S Regulation of Railways Bill, now before the House of Lords, consists of six parts, dealing with six distinct portions of railway economy, liabilities, or management. Part I. relates to "Accounts, Audit, &c.;" Part II., to the "Obligations and Liabilities of Companies as Carriers;" Part III. to "Provisions for Safety of Passengers;" Part IV. to "Compensation for Accidents;" Part V. to "Arbitration by Board of Trade;" and Part VI. is Miscellaneous.

The bill purposes to deal with railway accounts by requiring every company, seven days before the annual meeting, to prepare a statement and balance-sheet in a particular form, and to give copies on application to every share, mortgage, bond, or debenture holder; penalty for default, fifty pounds. The schedule containing the form in which these accounts are to be presented is not yet prepared, and much, of course, depends upon this. It is to be hoped, at any rate, that the schedule, when presented, will deal satisfactorily with the all-important "capital account" question. The penalty inflicted for non-compliance with the foregoing provision appears to us singularly inefficient: in our opinion the penalty should, like certain penalties prescribed by the Companies Act, 1862, attach to each day on which default continues, and be incurred by each director; and a special provision might be made for the

case in which accounts, though furnished in due time, might be in irregular form. The fifth section enacts that in case of any account so proving false the auditor or officer signing the same shall, unless he satisfies the Court which tries the case that he did so unwittingly, be liable to fine, imprisonment, or a £50 penalty. This provision was objected to by Lord Redesdale as throwing, in violation of the common rule, the *onus probandi* on the accused. This objection, however, must be taken with this qualification that when the evidence for the prosecution has been heard, the *onus probandi* very frequently *does* fall upon the accused. Any provision which tends to make audits actually what they purport to be will be a boon, but too harsh provisions usually fail to secure the end they aim at. The bill also provides that an extraordinary meeting of the company, or, upon certain specified applications by share or security holders, the Board of Trade, may appoint inspectors to examine the company's affairs thoroughly:—auditors are not in future to be *ex necessitate* shareholders: the Board of Trade may, on application by the directors at a general meeting, appoint an extra auditor of its own, paid by the company, and when the auditors differ in opinion, each may issue a statement to the shareholders at the company's cost.

With respect to the penalties prescribed by this portion of the Act, experience has amply proved that such penalties mean simply nothing, and, until their recovery is made the duty of a public prosecution department, there seems no probability of any alteration. The bill betrays considerable incompleteness of detail, but, until the schedule is issued, it is premature to make any final comment. All provisions which throw railway accounts open to the persons directly interested are entitled to approval; but companies' accounts are necessarily so excessively repulsive and intricate that the mere supervision thus obtainable is a very insufficient safeguard.

The remaining portions of the bill deal with subjects of comparatively small importance. The second part comprises some amendments in favour of the companies, as regards sea transit and small parcels; it also repeals the Carriers Act as to silk goods. Part III. requires the company to keep up a communication upon each train between passengers and guards. This section requires to be more worked out in detail. Parts IV. and V. provide that the Board of Trade may, upon joint application by the parties, appoint an arbitrator to decide questions of compensation for injury sustained by accidents. Part IV. requires a special meeting and certain other formalities, upon the presentation to Parliament of a bill for further powers, or an application for the Board of Trade certificate of completion. These are the main provisions of the Railways Regulation Bill, which passed through its second reading last Friday. In committee the bill will probably, supposing it to become law, receive much alteration, and we own to having experienced some disappointment at its crudeness. Taken as a whole, the amendments which it suggests will, if properly worked out, prove beneficial; but there is an amount of hesitation and incertitude about its provisions which makes it questionable whether it is worth while to proceed with this measure, instead of waiting for a complete one.

WE ARE HEARTILY glad that Mr. John Stuart Mill has spoken out in the House of Commons in favour of a regular system of inquiry in the matter of Parliamentary elections. Mr. Mill, taking the view which we have so frequently advocated, observed that, petition or no petition, there should, after every election, be an inquiry by competent persons, and continued:—

"The worst cases of bribery were often those in which there was no petition, or where a petition was presented solely with the view of being withdrawn by a compromise. In these cases both parties were tarred by the same brush, and, however certain it was that the seat had been obtained by bribery, the losing party were afraid to prosecute the

petition for fear of the disclosures, which would bring discredit upon themselves. Unless such cases were provided for, it was impossible effectually to put down bribery."

Mr. Mill might have added that when corruption prevails largely—as it does in many constituencies which never send up a petition—the electors and other gentry who make a regular income out of our representative system have also a direct interest in suppressing everything which looks like an inquiry. We believe that, sooner or later, we shall see a change in this respect, although there seems no hope for this session. To spend infinite pains in perfecting the tribunal, and make no attempt to bring its work within its grasp, is too ridiculous an inconsistency.

The Government Bill, as amended in pursuance of the altered scheme which Mr. Disraeli introduced to the House some while since, provides that her Majesty may appoint two "Honorary Justices of the Court of Common Pleas" from among the common law judges: when not engaged upon election trials these judges are to sit in the Exchequer Chamber, or (if Privy Counsellors) in the Privy Council; and should this number of election judges prove in any emergency insufficient to try the election cases with adequate speed, more common law judges may be detached for the unsavoury duty, leaving, we suppose, the ordinary common law business to get on as best it may, but any vacancy thus created on any circuit is to be filled up by the ordinary method, as in cases of illness, &c. It will, of course, be necessary to provide more judges if they are to be told off to try election petitions, for without such a compensation the common law business would be simply delayed *ad libitum* after a general election with many petitions. The bill, however, does not provide for this.

THE BANKRUPTCY BILLS.

Of the three bills first introduced by the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords affecting the law of debtor and creditor, two have reference to bankruptcy. One is a short Act repealing all the existing Bankrupt Acts, and is intended to clear the ground for the second, which purports to contain a complete code of bankruptcy law. This bill is founded upon a bill introduced by Sir John Rolt in the House of Commons last year, as it was modified by the Select Committee of that House, to which it was referred. But the present is considerably modified in several particulars from its predecessor, and it is a year since the subject was before the public.

We propose, therefore, to lay before our readers at present a general view of the proposed new legislation, reserving the more detailed consideration of its several branches for a future occasion.

As to the evils requiring a remedy in our present bankruptcy law, there is an almost entire agreement among lawyers and among the commercial community, though there is by no means the same agreement as to the remedy which ought to be applied. The law of bankruptcy, like other departments of law, may be conveniently divided into two branches, to borrow Bentham's phraseology, substantive and adjective law, the one comprising a series of rules by which the rights and duties of the various classes of persons affected by a bankruptcy are determined; the other providing a system of machinery by which those rights and duties may be enforced. Now, subject to certain exceptions, to be mentioned hereafter, the great defects of the present bankrupt laws, so far as they relate to bankruptcy proper, are to be found in the second branch, not in the first. The substantive law of bankruptcy is, for the most part, reasonable in principle, and gives tolerable satisfaction in practice. The rules which determine in what cases the management of a man's affairs shall be taken out of his own hands, and committed to his creditors, or to some one who represents them, or a Court acting for their benefit, are not, in the main, seriously objected to. The rules by which the claims of

creditors upon the estate of an insolvent person are determined, being all founded on the simple principle of equality, are, on the whole, equitable. The effect of bankruptcy as a transfer of the bankrupt's property is governed by simple and well-understood rules. And the various provisions affecting the rights of third parties other than the debtor and his creditors, such as those contained in the order and disposition clauses, and those relating to leases vested in the bankrupt, though much may be said against some of them, are in no instance glaringly unjust. And even the law as to the discharge of the bankrupt from his liabilities, though very objectionable in many respects, could by no means have produced the universal dissatisfaction with our present bankruptcy laws which prevails throughout the commercial community, and their unanimous condemnation by the legal profession. But when we turn to the machinery by which the law of bankruptcy is administered, we find that it possesses almost every conceivable defect.

The evils mainly complained of in the existing system may be thus stated:—First, the power which it puts into the hands of the debtor to defeat his creditors by making himself a bankrupt; secondly, the similar evil of the discharge of a debtor from his liabilities in all cases of bankruptcy, indiscriminately. These two defects are the chief defects belonging to the substantive part of the law. The third evil, and this is the main evil of all, is the enormous expense of realising and distributing the bankrupt's estate under the present system. The fourth main point of objection is the unsatisfactory nature of the tribunals by which the various incidental questions of law and fact which arise in the course of winding-up any insolvent estate are disposed of. The remaining great blot upon the bankrupt law is the wholly unsatisfactory working of the present laws as to the *quasi* bankruptcies which arise upon deeds of arrangement between debtors and their creditors. We shall deal with these several points in their order, and point out the leading principles upon which the proposed measure proposes to deal with each of them.

In old times the law of debtor and creditor was very hard, no doubt, upon the debtor. A debtor who could not pay his debts was liable, at the will of his creditor, to terrible penalties, including imprisonment for life. And creditors having such powers as this in their hands were able to put a frightful pressure upon their debtors, and to exercise the cruellest oppression. But now-a-days the tables are turned. Step by step the creditor's remedy against the person of his debtor has been very properly reduced to a practical nullity, and now the Lord Chancellor proposes to take away the last remnant of it; while on the other hand the Bankruptcy Laws have put into the debtor's hands an engine against his creditors. A debtor may, under the law as regulated by the Act of 1861, at any moment, without any preliminary steps whatever, without complying with any previous conditions, whether he has the means of paying one farthing to his creditors or not, and whether his creditors approve of the proceeding or not, procure himself to be adjudicated bankrupt on his own petition; and the result may be that without his creditors receiving a sixpence he simply escapes from his debts. And he may repeat this process *ad libitum*. Accordingly many cases have come before the public of systematic bankrupts who live luxuriously on credit, and from time to time discharge their debts by obtaining their discharge in bankruptcy. And everybody acquainted with these matters knows that many a creditor who ventures to press for his money is simply silenced by a threat of bankruptcy. The present bill proposes to mitigate this evil in two ways, first by controlling the debtors' right to make himself bankrupt, and secondly by qualifying the effect of a discharge as we shall point out below. It provides that a debtor wishing to make himself bankrupt may file a declaration of insolvency, which shall be gazetted, but this declaration shall not be deemed an act of bankruptcy till after the lapse of twenty-one days. At the end of that time three days are given dur-

ing which any creditor may petition for adjudication, and failing that, two days more during which the debtor may petition. Now there can be no doubt that these provisions tend to mitigate the existing evils; they make the proceedings of the debtor less rapid and summary, and they give the creditors the opportunity of taking matters into their own hands. But taken alone they would be very insufficient, for they would still leave to the debtor the power of clearing himself from all his debts without paying a penny towards them, and without the consent of his creditors.

The second evil we have mentioned, and it is closely connected with the last, is the indiscriminate discharge of every debtor from liability, though he may have paid nothing and though he may afterwards have means of payment. Upon this subject the new bill contains provisions most excellent in their object, and worthy of the most mature consideration; of which, however, we can at present only point out the general scope. It is proposed that the order of discharge shall not, as a general rule, be an absolute discharge of the bankrupt's after-acquired property in respect of debts proveable; but that at any time, or from time to time after the order of discharge, the London Court of Bankruptcy, if there be good cause to believe that the bankrupt, after a reasonable allowance for the maintenance of his family and payment of his debts, is able to pay anything towards the debts under the bankruptcy, may summon and examine him on oath, and require the production of books, &c. And the Court may order him to pay such sum as it thinks fit towards a dividend, and may, if necessary, appoint a receiver of his estate. If he fails to pay when ordered, his estate shall vest in the provisional trustee. And the moneys thus got in shall go to pay a dividend. But a majority in number, representing three-fourths in value of the creditors, may, at a special meeting held at any time after adjudication, resolve that the bankrupt's after-acquired property shall be discharged. Similar provisions are made for charging the after-acquired property of a debtor entering into a deed of arrangement, with power for the like majority to discharge him either by the original deed or by a supplemental deed. The great question to be decided with respect to these provisions is simply, will they be found in practice sufficiently stringent? We are very much inclined to doubt whether creditors would be found to act upon them in any very considerable number of cases, and yet it is not easy to suggest any alternative scheme. But this is just one of those matters which may probably be well dealt with by the Select Committee to which the bill has been referred. As to the soundness of the principle we have no doubt.

The main object of all bankruptcy proceedings is simply to collect the assets belonging to the bankrupt, and apply them rateably in payment of his debts. But in the course of such an operation, just as in any other business transaction, there must from time to time arise various disputed questions of law and of fact as to the rights of the various parties interested, and those must be decided by some competent tribunal. Hitherto these two functions have both been discharged by the Courts of Bankruptcy. Most of our readers are familiar enough with the practice in bankruptcy, and it will be enough to say here that the principles on which bankrupt estates have hitherto been administered is that they should be administered in and by the Court; every step, from the first moment to the last, was a step in a judicial proceeding, and regulated and paid for in fees accordingly; and the acting person, the assignee, though chosen by the creditors, acted, not under their directions, but under those of the Court, and dealt with the estate, not according to their wish, but the rules prevailing in the court. The principle of the new bill, borrowed from the law of Scotland, is to take the administration of the estate from the Court, and give it to creditors, leaving it to be carried out upon the principles which they may determine, and under their own supervision.

For the purpose of carrying this principle into effect, it is proposed to provide that the creditors may, at the first meeting, choose (subject to the approval of the Court) a trustee of the estate, either a creditor or not, for whose remuneration they may provide as they think fit; and may also appoint one or two persons, being creditors, as inspectors, to superintend the trustee's administration of the estate. Upon confirmation of his appointment the estate is to vest in the trustee, having till then been vested in the provisional trustee. And the trustee is to get in and manage the estate in accordance with the directions of the auditors, given at the first meeting or otherwise; and in the absence of such directions, under the direction of the inspectors. The trustee, in declaring dividends, is to follow the directions of the creditors, if any are given to him, and failing these, of the inspectors; and if there are no inspectors, then he is to follow general orders on this subject. In favour of this scheme there are three main arguments. First, it enables the creditors to dispose of what is substantially their own property in their own way; and there is no doubt that the person most interested in any property is usually the best person to have the management of it. Secondly, this is, in principle, the plan in favour of which the mass of the mercantile community have declared themselves. And, thirdly, a similar system is found to work efficiently and economically in Scotland, from which country the present proposal is adopted.

But as we have said, the winding up of a bankrupt's estate generally entails of necessity the decision of a number of questions of law and fact, and for the decision of these a tribunal must be provided, and with this matter the bill of course has to deal. Upon this subject its provisions, as they at present stand, must, we think, have taken the profession and the public very much by surprise; indeed, we cannot help suspecting that there is some mistake or oversight in the framing of the clauses. The bill recognises three distinct classes of courts—the London court, the country courts of bankruptcy, and the county courts. The London court, the first judges of which are to be the present commissioners, is to have jurisdiction for twenty miles round London. The country district courts are to be constituted as at present so long as they continue to exist, but no vacancies in the appointments are to be filled up. And the county courts (or such county courts as may be assigned for the purpose by Order in Council) are to have jurisdiction in their respective districts. But when we come to look at the provisions as to the commencement of proceedings, we find that proceedings are to be taken in the London court if the bankrupt resides or carries on business within the London district; in a country court if within a country district; and in the county court if *within neither*. So that as long as a country court continues to exist the county court in that district will have no jurisdiction whatever in bankruptcy, and as soon as the country court dies out the county court will have exclusive jurisdiction, for there is no limit of amount, and no option given in any case. This opens a pleasant prospect in the future for the county court judges in such towns as Liverpool, Manchester, and Birmingham, and for the ordinary county court suitors in those places.

While speaking of the tribunals in bankruptcy as proposed by this bill, we cannot leave unnoticed the provisions for appeals, or abstain from entering our protest against what is proposed. The bill gives an appeal from the country or county courts to the London court, which appeal, in cases under £300, is to be final, except with leave. In other cases there is to be a further appeal to the Court of Appeal in Chancery (though the appeal may be to this court in the first instance); and with leave a further appeal to the House of Lords. We hope and believe that Parliament will not for one moment entertain a proposal for a treble appeal.

The last point upon which we propose to touch is the proposed scheme for the regulation of deeds of arrangement. The law hitherto has made the validity and bind-

ing character of such deeds depend upon their compliance with certain conditions expressed in the Act of 1861, or imported into it by the ingenuity of judges. And it has hitherto been open to any party interested to question the validity of the deed on any occasion on which it has been necessary to rely upon it as a ground of claim or as a ground of defence, and in any court in which the question might happen to arise. The present bill, like that of last year, proposes that no deed shall bind a non-assenting creditor till a certificate of its due execution in compliance with the statutory conditions has been obtained from the Court of Bankruptcy, but that that certificate once obtained shall, subject only to appeal, be conclusive in all courts, and the question shall not be re-opened. This is a change the importance and utility of which it is difficult to over estimate.

This bill, like most others, is full of defects of detail, especially so in the clauses as to deeds of arrangement, and will need very free handling in committee. But we have not space to examine these at present. Our object is to lay before our readers a general view of the modern outline of the measure; we may have other opportunities of considering its details.

BABY-FARMING.

A new species of murder has lately been developed amongst us (or rather, its development has lately been discovered); and indeed has almost attained the rank of a recognised system. We allude to the practice of persons, under the name of adoption, or otherwise, undertaking the charge of infants committed to their tender mercies by unnatural parents; the not unexpected result being that in a short time the children sicken and die. Truly the ancient Roman custom of exposing newly-born infants was preferable, both on the grounds of morality and of humanity. That such a practice should be possible can hardly be said to be the fault of the criminal law. There is plenty of law to interfere with the quiet prosecution of this lucrative branch of industry; the difficulty is to discover the instances and to prove the facts. It is clear that a mere *non-feasance*, as neglect to supply a person with proper and sufficient food when it was the prisoner's duty to do so, constitutes of itself a misdemeanour. Should death ensue from such neglect, the offence will be either murder or manslaughter, according to the circumstances of the case. But it is in no way necessary that death should ensue in order to constitute an offence punishable by law. It is, however, in any case necessary that the sufferer should, either from infancy, old age, or otherwise, be unable to take care of himself. It was so laid down in *R. v. Friend*, Russ. & R. 20. This was a very flagrant case, being almost an anticipation of the baby-farming system. There a man had nearly starved to death two girls of twelve or fourteen, who had been placed with him by other persons nominally as apprentices. There was no proof of active ill-treatment, but the girls were cruelly starved, although death happily did not follow. The master was convicted of a misdemeanour, and sentenced to imprisonment. The presiding judge brought the point of law before a meeting of all the judges. The majority was of opinion that it was an indictable offence to "neglect to provide sufficient food, bedding, &c., to any infant of tender years unable to provide or take care for itself (whether such infant were child, apprentice, or servant) whom a man was obliged by duty to contract to provide for, so as thereby to injure its health." This lays down the law clearly enough. The sequel of the case is rather curious. The judges were of opinion that the girls in question were not unable to take care of themselves; and, therefore, that the indictment was bad; but influenced apparently by the enormity of the moral offence, they adjourned the final decision, *sine die*, and let the prisoner suffer the whole of his imprisonment. *R. v. Friend* should be remembered as showing that in any case of this character the indictment, whether for

murder or for a misdemeanour, must charge the child to have been of tender years, and unable to take care of itself. Nor does the law apply to the case of children alone. In *R. v. Smith*, Lew. C.C., it was even contended that a grown woman, who was alleged to have been of infirm mind, had been brought so completely under the control of her mistress as to be unable to take care of herself; and that the mistress was, therefore, rightly convicted of murder for not supplying her with sufficient food, whereby she died. The Court was of opinion that the servant was not proved to have been unable to take care of herself, and the conviction was therefore quashed; but it would seem that had the facts been as alleged, the conviction would have been supported. To the same effect was *R. v. Marriott*, 8 C. & P. 425, where the distinction between murder and manslaughter in such cases was very clearly laid down. There the prisoner was indicted for starving an aged and infirm woman to death. Patteson, J., charged the jury in these words: "If the prisoner was guilty of wilful neglect, so gross and wilful that you are satisfied he must have contemplated the death of Mrs. Warner, then he will be guilty of murder. If, however, you think only that he was so careless that her death was occasioned by his negligence, though he did not contemplate it, he will be guilty of manslaughter." It must, however, be proved in such cases that the prisoner was in the actual possession of means to provide for the child or other person ill-treated. See *R. v. Chandler*, 3 W. R. 404, Dear. C. C. 453, where a conviction was quashed for want of such proof, though it was shown that the prisoner might have applied to the parochial authorities for relief and had not done so.

The above were all cases of mere *nonfeasance*. *A fortiori* where any amount of *malfeasance* is proved, however small, the case will be greatly strengthened. Thus where parish officers moved a child about from parish to parish till it died from want of care and sustenance, this was held to be murder, 4 Black. Com. 197. And so, also, where a sick person was exposed to the open air whereby he died. (*id.*)

The above citations abundantly show that culpable neglect on the part of a person who undertakes the charge of an infant amounts to a misdemeanour, and if death ensues, to manslaughter, or murder, according to the facts.

But unhappily the difficulty of all such cases is to prove them. It is the interest of all persons concerned to hush the matter up. The death of an infant is too common an occurrence to excite much remark. And no strong measures are required to bring about the result. It is not even necessary that the child should have a positive insufficiency of food. Improper diet, foul air, want of cleanliness, and a general neglect of the various small matters upon which an infant's health depends, will usually be sufficient to effect the desired end. In such cases it may easily be supposed how difficult it is to procure the necessary evidence. Some further means are required to meet the evil.

It has been suggested that the evil might be met by some scheme in the nature of a compulsory registration. Insure that the situation of every such child shall be known to the police, and that its death shall at once be followed by inquiry, and you make a great stride towards the suppression of this abominable iniquity.

The difficulties attendant upon such a course are no doubt considerable. A mother who goes out to work pays a neighbour to take care of her children. A baby is left with a relative for change of air. It would be absurd to require registration in such cases as these.

The enactment would probably be framed something after the following fashion:—It would be enacted that every person who either solely or jointly with others should assume the entire charge of a child under the age of five years for more than a specified period, should register the fact at the nearest police-office, in a book to be kept for that purpose. Provided: that no such registration should be required

where the person, or any one of the persons assuming such entire charge, should be a relative of the child. Such registration to consist of the name and address of the person assuming charge of the child, the name and age of the child itself, and the names and addresses of the parents, where known. In case of the death of any such child, the person having charge of the child to be bound immediately to give information thereof to the same police-office. The superintendent of police of the district should then have power at his discretion to require a coroner's inquest to be held. The wilful omission of any of these acts on the part of the person having charge of the child to be punishable by fine or imprisonment. A provision might be inserted, if thought advisable, that registration should not be necessary where the task was entirely gratuitous. But this would open a wide door for evasion.

In reply to such a scheme as that which we have sketched out, may be urged the inconvenience—the expediency of importing into England anything in the nature of police supervision. These no doubt are objections, *quantum valeant*, but the evil is a momentous one, every proffered remedy should be fairly investigated, and we do not think the inconveniences of such a scheme would be so great as to amount to an insuperable objection.

The correspondent upon this subject, whose letter we printed in our last number, suggests the appointment of a public prosecutor. That, undoubtedly, is a great desideratum, and is needed for other crimes than the one which we have been discussing; but given a public prosecutor, it will be a question whether without some additional machinery, these occult offences would bring themselves sufficiently within his ken.

ORDERS OF DISCHARGE IN BANKRUPTCY.

No. II.

At the conclusion of our last article on this subject we showed that the framer of the Act of 1861, when enabling the Court of Bankruptcy to refuse a bankrupt trader his discharge for having carried on trade by means of fictitious capital, had in his immediate contemplation the circumstances of a case of *Re Lawrence, Mortimore, and Schröder*, and intended to check, as far as such an enactment could do, the kind of business which had been carried on by these bankrupts. Before passing on from this head of our subject we think it will be useful to refer to the facts of that case somewhat more in detail.

These will be found stated at sufficient length in the report on the hearing before Mr. Commissioner Holroyd (9 W. R. 674) from which it appears that the bankrupts were hide and leather factors, the firm having two branches, one at London, and the other at Liverpool, and that their business consisted in buying hides on commission for tanners, on whom they drew bills at four months for the amounts, and for some of whom they also afterwards sold the leather, remitting the proceeds in cash or in bills. Their opportunity of indulging in bill transactions was therefore considerable, and that they availed themselves of it is shown by the startling facts that during a period of about three years and a half, the cash and bills paid to, and the bills and acceptances received from, the eleven houses with which their London branch was chiefly connected, amounted to nearly £6,000,000, while the value of the goods sold to such houses during the same period was not more than £750,000, and of the hides sold for them less than £500,000. One of the modes in which the bankrupts were enabled to pour such a flood of bills into the market so disproportionate to the actual transactions was by from time to time, instead of renewing bills drawn on their correspondents, drawing fresh bills on the latter for the balance of the account due from them without treating those bills as paid, or, as it was called, in respect of their "general indebtedness." Upon this course of dealing the Commissioner observed as follows:—"The bankers" (who discount the bills) "see that the bills bear upon the face of them all the appearance of legitimate trade

bills, and are such as would pass in the ordinary course between a factor and his principals, and the particularity with which they are drawn as to amounts, and their being expressed "for value received," and addressed to persons by the description of "tanners or curriers," would probably have some influence with them in forming their opinion of the bills. . . . Bills of this kind made use of for the purpose of creating fictitious capital or giving a false credit when pushed to an extravagant extent, are a great abuse of credit and cannot be too strongly reprobated. As to accommodation bills, I think the rule should be extended to all bills circulated for the purpose of fictitious credit, or not arising out of regular trade transactions; they should be subject to a rigid investigation as to whether the names upon the bills were at the time considered to be good and genuine, whether they have been dealt in systematically or to meet a temporary embarrassment, and whether any misrepresentation has been made as to the character of the bills." This passage seems to us to illustrate and explain the language used by the Lord Justices in *Ex parte Harrison*, to which we have before alluded, and we have on that account recurred to the subject, but we must now pass on to notice some of the other difficulties which have arisen in interpreting the 159th section of the Act.

What we have called the fourth head of the offence there specified as depriving the bankrupt of a right to an order of discharge, namely, "his insolvency being attributable to rash and hazardous speculation or unjustifiable extravagance in living," comprises two distinct branches, and as to both it may fairly be said that the objections on the ground of vagueness are very difficult to meet. To take the first of the two—one learned judge explains rash and hazardous speculation to mean such as no reasonable man, or man of ordinary commercial prudence, would under similar circumstances venture to embark in, and we would ask whether it is not really explaining *ignotum per ignotius*, and whether the explanation does not leave us quite as much in the dark as before as to the rules by which the judgment of the Court will be guided in determining this question. We may illustrate the difficulty in construing these words by the case of *Re Downham*, 11 W. R. 577. The only transaction which the Court was called upon to criticize was a contract which the bankrupt had entered into for the purchase of a mine, the contract being dependent on the nature of the company to be formed to work the mine. On this Lord Westbury observed, "such a transaction frequently occurs, and beneficial concerns often so originate. It cannot be said that such a contract which both parties believed to be capable of being honestly brought into operation was a rash speculation. It was hazardous inasmuch as uncertainty attended its success; but the important word probably was rash, that is to say, one that no reasonable man would have entertained." That the word "rash" is the governing word in this part of the section is an opinion shared by Lord Justices Rolt, who justly observes, "all commerce is, in its nature, in some degree speculative, and speculation is hazardous. The offence in the 159th section cannot consist merely of hazardous speculation. It is obvious that 'rash speculation' is of the essence of the case." In the case in which this observation was made (*Ex parte Heyn*, 15 W. R. 1158, 2 L. R. Ch. 650, the bankrupt when liable on bills for cotton to an amount of £29,000, with nothing but the expected proceeds of the cotton to meet them, and being practically insolvent, gave or renewed during the six months following, orders for more cotton to the value of £30,000. A rapid fall of 50 per cent., in the price of cotton ensuing, he stopped payment with a loss on the cotton of £30,000. This was held to have been an instance of rash speculation, cotton being an article the price of which was very liable to fluctuate, and it being, therefore, the duty of the trader to exercise great caution and abstain from speculation for a chance of a profit for himself, when it was certain that the loss, if such should be the result, would fall on his customers. This distinction between

speculations which are hazardous, and speculations which are also rash, may seem at first sight plausible, but to say nothing of the practical difficulty of applying the distinction, we are not sure that it meets the justice of the case. In Lord Justice Turner's words, "we are living in days in which wild and hazardous speculations are rife; if they are attended with success, the world in general and the commercial world, no less than the world in general, is ever ready to praise the boldness with which they are undertaken; and if, as is too frequently the case, misfortune and ruin follow in their train, it is not just that those who have been ready to encourage them should be permitted to call for punishment as severe as if there had been positive fraud or dishonesty." These remarks, it is true, are aimed rather against severity of the punishment than its imposition at all, but putting together the facts that speculation is allowed to be legitimate, and that some degree of rashness is a condition of success, it may be doubted whether even rash speculation *per se* ought to be included in the list of causes of insolvency, which justify the refusal of an order of discharge. A merchant who consigned goods to a correspondent abroad, which were bought for £33,000, and realised £1,500, and a commercial traveller who purchased hops for £365 which he resold at £113, have been respectively held to have come within this clause, but it is clear that in these and similar cases there is great temptation to attach too much importance to the issue of the speculation, and if this has been unsuccessful to brand the speculation as rash, although it may have been only injudicious, and, therefore, as the court can hardly pretend to punish incompetence for business, not within the clause in question.

Granting then the words "rash and hazardous speculation" to be somewhat obscure, do the cases help us to define more accurately what "unjustifiable extravagance in living" may mean? We think not. The difficulty here is to fix by what standard, social, commercial, or moral, this question is to be tried? It may be morally unjustifiable to spend money simply in keeping up appearances, but such conduct may be recognised in society and be commercially profitable. The cases on this subject are very few, and we shall only refer to the well-known one of *Ex parte Hammond*, 6 D. M. & G. 699, in which laying in a large stock of wine and considerable domestic expenditure were excused, on the ground of the alleged expediency of the bankrupt keeping a table to which he might occasionally or frequently ask persons with whom he had dealings in the course of his trade. The other cases merely show that a supposed necessity of keeping up appearances is not a sufficient excuse for lavish expenditure, and that such conduct is not an offence within the clause we are considering, unless the proximate cause of the bankrupt's insolvency.

In dismissing this subject we may observe that a bankrupt's insolvency can hardly have been caused by "rash and hazardous speculation," or "unjustifiable extravagance of living," without his having at the same time "contracted debts without a reasonable expectation of being able to pay them," and this affords some reason against making the former distinct heads of offence. We have purposely avoided a discussion of the different penalties which the Court may impose under the 159th section, but we may remind our readers that only one of such penalties can be imposed, *Re Marks*, 14 W. R. 321, 1 L. R. Ch. 334, this rule not having been strictly adhered to in some of the cases which have come under our notice.

CORRECTING THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF ENGLAND.—At the Assizes at Lewes, on Wednesday, in a case of felony from Fraud, a police-constable of the E.S.C., whilst giving evidence, was asked the question by Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, "Did you find it just as it was?" To this he replied, "No, my lord; it was just as it were." His lordship pocketed the affront, as also the attack upon his Lindley Murray, whilst the court roared with laughter.—*Surrey Standard*.

RECENT DECISIONS.

EQUITY.

PRESUMPTION OF LIFE AND DEATH.

Re Benham, V. C. M., 15 W. R. 741, L. J. R., 16 W. R. 180.

We are not surprised at finding that the decision in this case has been reversed on appeal, as it appeared to us to involve a misconception of the mode in which certain rules of presumption should be applied.

The rules in question are, first, that a person once living will, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, be presumed to continue alive, at least until such a period as may be looked upon as a superior limit of the duration of human life; and the second, extended apparently by analogy from the Bigamy Act, 1 Jac. 1, c. 11, and the 19 Car. 2, c. 3, enabling reversioners or lessors to re-enter without proof of the death of the *cestui que vient* on the lands held by tenants for lives—that after an absence of seven years without communication through any likely sources, the absentee will be presumed to be dead, so as to justify distribution of property in which he is interested on that assumption.

The question in *Re Benham's Trusts* was as to the practical result of these two rules. A great number of cases having established the principle that this presumption of death at the end of seven years is totally irrespective of the date of death, and that the *onus* of proving death at any particular date lies on those who allege it; the Vice-Chancellor stretched this a little further, and on the failure of this proof dealt with the fund on the opposite hypothesis. It does not, however, follow in these cases that because the *onus* of proof is on one claimant the Court will, on his failing to adduce proof, award the fund to the other.

A more correct view is to regard the Court as requiring a particular claimant to adduce a certain proof before it will act in his favour, but not necessarily, in default, acting for the opposing claimant.

In *Re Benham*, a legatee under the will of a testator who died in 1860, had disappeared in 1854, and his representatives were held entitled as against those of the testator.

Such a decision is evidently inconsistent with the rule laid down by the Court of Exchequer Chamber after an elaborate discussion in *Nepveu v. Doe*, 2 M. & W. 913, that "presumption relates only to the fact of death, and the time, whenever material, must be a subject of distinct proof." The action in that case was in ejectment, and the cause of action arose on the death of a person who had disappeared twenty-five years before action brought, so that it was material with reference to the Statute of Limitations whether the death could be presumed to have occurred at the end of the seven years.

Judgment was given for the defendant on the ground that proof of death within twenty years had not been shown.

Assuming the authority of this case, it would be necessary to hold that under circumstances like those in *Re Benham* no claim could be made through the missing legatee. But then the question arises how could the next of kin claim on the hypothesis of a lapse, as for that purpose they must prove that the legatee predeceased the testator, and there seems to be no escape from the conclusion that the fund must remain *in medio*. This the Courts have been reluctant to decide, as the following cases show.

Dowley v. Wingfield, 14 Sim. 277. A. disappears (we use the words in the sense of being last heard of) twenty months before his father's death intestate. His only brother was treated as sole next of kin on his giving security to refund. *Ex parte Creed*, 1 Dr. 236. A legacy is bequeathed to A. by a testator who died less than seven years after A.'s disappearance,

on condition of A.'s surviving a person who predeceased the testator by a few weeks, and in default to A.'s issue. The latter were not allowed to receive the legacy. *Lambe v. Orton*, 8 W. R. 111. A., who disappeared four years before the death of an intestate, held to have survived him, and that the *onus* was on persons disputing the claim of A.'s representatives of showing that A. was not one of the next of kin. *Dunn v. Snowden*, 11 W. R. 160. Property was distributed on the supposition that a legatee who had disappeared three years before the testator's death survived him and died afterwards. The same was done in *Thomas v. Thomas*, *ibid.* 298, the Vice-Chancellor objecting to the form in which the rule was expressed in the marginal note to the former case, namely, that a person not heard of for seven years must be taken to have lived to the end of the seven years, but substantially reasserting it in the form that a person must be taken to have lived until the lapse of a reasonable time from his disappearance.

It must be admitted that we have here, if not a strong concurrence of authority, a series of decisions by an able judge, establishing a rule practically equivalent to that asserted by Vice-Chancellor Malin, for we do not see how they can be otherwise explained, but we cannot discover a sufficient foundation for such a rule, and we have good authority for saying that a person claiming under a will or intestacy must prove his title. Accordingly, in *Re Benham's Trusts*, Lord Justice Rolfe discharged the Vice-Chancellor's order, observing that the case was one, not of presumption, but of proof, and as there was not proof for the Court to act upon, further inquiries must therefore be made. No doubt, in a case where a person has disappeared more than seven years before the death of the testator or intestate, the claimant may rely upon the presumption of such person's death at that date, but he will not be allowed to establish his title by insisting (as was in effect done in *Dunn v. Snowden*) on a presumption of life for three years and death in the remaining four. Even in the former case we think the time on which the presumption arises too small, at least, in the case of personal estate, which, if delivered to the wrong person, may be irrecoverably lost, and we should prefer a rule that the property claimed should be secured in court and the income only, until further years had elapsed, dealt with. On the other hand it is desirable that some provision should be made towards quieting the possession of those who are allowed to receive the property, and we believe that ours is the only one of the European States in which, in the event of the return of the absentee, after an interval however long, the possessor of his property is obliged to account, not only for the *corpus*, but for the past income, except so far as he may be protected by the Statute of Limitations. The legislation of most of those States enables persons interested in the absentee's property to obtain an order for delivery of possession to them after a certain interval of absence, and on obtaining such order they are only bound, in case of his return, to restore at most the property to him in its then condition, it being in some cases sufficient to restore a portion of it, and an absence of thirty years in France entitling them absolutely to it, and in Prussia, subject to an allowance by way of maintenance to the original owner. The interval varies in different States, but is usually about twenty years; this time, however, being frequently reduced to as few as three or four, if the age of the person disappearing was advanced, or when last heard of he was exposed to imminent danger. The mode in which the law of Portugal deals with cases like that in *Re Benham* is peculiar. By it, where a succession devolves on a person who cannot be found, his representatives are entitled to it after ten years from his disappearance, but only provisionally, until the time when he would have reached the age of a hundred years, when the persons who would be his successors at that time become absolutely entitled.

CONVEYANCE BY MARRIED WOMAN OF LAND DEVISED ON TRUST FOR SALE.

Franks v. Bollans, V. C. S., 16 W. R. 173.

Although, by the doctrine of conversion, real estate devised upon trust for sale is, for purposes of transmission, forthwith regarded as actually converted into personally, yet, in consequence of the comprehensive phraseology of section 77 of the Fines and Recoveries Act, 3 & 4 Will. 4, c. 74, it retains, for the purposes of that section, the characteristics of realty; that is, it is still considered as an estate in land so far as this, that a married woman interested as a *cestui que trust* must, if she desires to convey it, do so by a deed duly acknowledged in accordance with the provisions of the Fines and Recoveries Act. By a deed executed with the proper formalities under that provision she may at once convey the land, and bar herself of her equity to a settlement in the purchase-money: *vide Briggs v. Chamberlain*, 1 W. R. 346; but in spite of the "conversion" which took place in consequence of the devise in trust for sale, her interest in the subject-matter of the devise requires, for transmission by her, the formality attached by section 77 of the Fines and Recoveries Act to real property. In *Briggs v. Chamberlain* (*ubi sup.*) real estate was devised upon trust for sale, with the usual power to suspend the sale, and declarations that such power should not prevent the real estate from being impressed with the character of personality immediately from the testator's death. A married woman was entitled to a share in the real estate in question. The sale not yet having been made, she, by a deed duly acknowledged under the Fines and Recoveries Act, joined her husband in mortgaging her share. Vice-Chancellor Wood said that in this instance the real estate, not having been sold, already constituted an interest in land which brought it under that statute. This is in consequence of the ample scope of the wording of the Act—"Any estate which she . . . may have in any lands."

In *Franks v. Bollans*, the case before us, a married woman was interested in the lands decreed in trust for sale, the actual sale having been suspended. She and her husband had joined the other *cestui que trust* in selling to the trustee, but the deed was not acknowledged by the married woman, as required by the Fines and Recoveries Act. Vice-Chancellor Stuart holding that the conveyance to the trustee could not as such be supported, the question was, whether any difference was made by the confirmation of the transaction by the husband and wife, who, by their receipts for the purchase money, had affected to release the trustee in respect of the trust of the land; and it was contended that, in point of actual fact, the husband having had the money paid into his hands, an actual conversion had taken place, and the husband could give a good discharge; but the conveyance to the trustee being regarded as no conveyance, the Court had to regard the land as still unsold, and consequently, the wife's interest in the land would only be released by a properly acknowledged deed under the statute. Had the deed by which the land was conveyed to the trustee been properly acknowledged by the wife, the transaction would, of course, have been still open to objection, as a purchase made by a person standing on a fiduciary relation.

[Note for reference.—"Jarman on Wills." I. 568.]

REVIEWS.

The Sale and Transfer of Shares in Companies. By KENELM E. DIGBY, of Lincoln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law. London: H. Sweet.

This is a little book which deserves commendation, because it proceeds upon the plan of fairly digesting and arranging the law upon the subject with which it deals, and is not, as too many books now-a-days are, a mere string of cases.

The subject in question is perhaps the most repulsive and unsatisfactory with which a lawyer can be concerned; to

say that the author has made it perfectly clear would not be correct, for it has yet to be shown that it is capable of being made so; he has, however, written a monograph upon the subject, which will be of use to any one, whether broker or lawyer, who has occasion to examine the intricacy of decisions relating thereto.

The book is dated prior to the delivery of the judgment in the now well known case of *Grissell v. Bristowe*, 16 W. R. 428, which is shortly noticed by means of a small fly sheet inserted into the volume, and it is fair to Mr. Digby to remark that the decision of the Court in that case is in accordance with his conclusions.

It is to be regretted that, having been at the pains of compiling a really meritorious and serviceable book, the author should have impaired its usefulness by restricting his citations of recent cases to the *Law Reports* and *Weekly Notes*. The reader is doubly a sufferer in consequence of this plan being adopted. For instance, the very important case of *Sheppard v. Murphy*, *Law Reports* (Ireland), 1 Eq. 690, noticed by us, *supra*, p. 338, is thus ignored, and the same is the case with *Robins v. Edwards*, 15 W. R. 1065; while numerous cases are cited only from the *Weekly Notes* of the *Law Reports*, which are reported in one or the other series of regular and reliable reports.

Railway Accidents or Collisions: their Effects upon the Nervous System. The Substance of a Paper read before the Harveian Medical Society. By WILLIAM CAMPS, M.D., Edin. Second Edition. London: H. K. Lewis.

This pamphlet, as its title hints, is addressed to medical rather than to legal readers, and scarcely calls for notice in our columns. The author concludes by suggesting that most of the disputes between railway companies and sufferers might be settled by arbitration, a mode of settlement which he strongly recommends, and adds a plan which he thinks would answer, viz., that each party should agree to abide by the opinion of some able medical man "upon the case of the plaintiff" (by which we suppose the author to intend a medical and not a legal "case"), or failing this, that each party should appoint their own medical arbitrator, the two arbitrators appointing a medical umpire. It is quite competent to railway companies and the possessors of injured nervous systems, to adopt either of these modes if they please, and we must take it that these plans are not adopted because they are not approved of by the parties. Settling cases by arbitration is now no new thing, and it is always competent to the parties to revert to that method of dealing with their disputes.

The Magisterial Formulist: being a complete Collection of Forms and Precedents for practical use, in all cases out of Quarter Sessions and in parochial matters, by Magistrates, their Clerks, Attorneys, and Constables. By GEORGE C. OKE, Chief Clerk to the Lord Mayor of London. Fourth edition. London: Butterworths, 7, Fleet-street. 1868.

The last edition of this work was published in 1862, and contained forms applicable to the legislation down to the end of the session of 1861. During the six sessions since that time many most important changes and extensions of the law administered by the magistracy have been made, and a publication of a new edition of this most useful collection of forms has consequently been urgently called for. Mr. Oke's works are so well known to all who are concerned in the administration of magisterial law that we need say no more than that the present edition seems to have been prepared with his usual care. On a reference to the very full index at the end of the book, we have been unable to detect the omission of any subject in the place where it might be expected to be found; and such of the forms as the author has had to draw, and not merely to transcribe, appear well executed. That this task is not a mere mechanical one any person who has had experience of the wording of modern Acts of Parliament must be well aware. To transcribe the language "no person shall," do a particular act into the form "A. B. did it," is by no means a simple matter where the act is described by the Legislature, as we frequently find it, in a long sentence, with exception and proviso jumbled together in parenthesis. We think Mr. Oke's guidance in such matters may safely be relied upon, as he appears to prefer, where the difficulty is a substantial one, to point it out rather than permit any one, by blindly following him, to fall into the possibility of a mistake. We may give as instances the form for unlawfully employing a "young per-

son" contrary to the Workshop Regulation Act, 1867. Mr. Oke, rather than undertake what we consider the impossible task of interpreting by a general form the enactment contained in the 7th section of that Act, recommends, as we understand him, that in each case the specific period of employment which it is suggested is illegal should be set out. Again, the forms printed at the end of the Councils of Conciliation Act, 1867, are given exactly as they are by the Legislature, but attention is called by a marginal note to the curious fact that the Act is described in the forms as an Act of the 24th year of the Queen, instead of the 30th & 31st, as it should be. The mistake probably arose from a bill to the same effect as that which was passed last session having been brought forward six or seven years before. As, however, the further blunder was committed of making no reference to the forms in the Act, so that there is no provision whatever for the forms given being held sufficient, we think, in the extremely unlikely event of any case ever arising under the Act, a practitioner would be justified in correcting for himself the error of the Legislature.

COURTS.

COURT OF CHANCERY.

STATEMENT OF THE NUMBER OF CAUSES, PETITIONS, &c., disposed of in Court in the week ending Thursday, March 26, 1868.

L. C.		L. J.		M. R.		V. C. S.		V. C. M.		V. C. G.	
AP.	AP. M.	AP.	AP. M.	C.	P.	C.	P.	C.	P.	C.	P.
				10	19	17	24	9	18	8	20

COUNTY COURTS.

LAMBETH.

(Before J. PITT TAYLOR, Esq., Judge.)

March 24.—*Gilbert v. Beckley.*

Joint Debtors.

The rule *nisi* granted in this case (*supra* 339) at the instance of the plaintiff came on for hearing on the 3rd March, when the plaintiff did not appear, and the defendant, appearing by his attorney, alleged that the judgment had been obtained against him by a breach of faith. The application was in consequence of non-appearance of plaintiff struck out, and the defendant on the following day applied for a rule *nisi* to set aside the judgment. The application was granted, and the case came on for argument again to-day, both parties appearing.

Mr. Bickley, defendant's attorney, explained the grounds of his application to be that his client, when this judgment was obtained, went to the plaintiff's office and saw a clerk there, to whom he stated that he paid his share, £5 13s. 3d., being one-half the amount due, into court on a previous summons, and that he was then told that he need not trouble himself any more about the matter, as it was intended to enforce payment of the other half against Morton, who had been made a joint defendant in both actions, but had not been served. Defendant considered the matter settled, until he received notice of plaintiff's intended application on March 3rd. Defendant was never in partnership with Morton, and was not liable for any more than he had paid.

The plaintiff said the matter had been attended to by a clerk of his, and the second action had been brought for the original claim in mistake instead of for half the amount. Beckley and Morton were in partnership at the time the debt accrued, and as Morton could not be found Beckley was liable for the other half of the claim.

Mr. PITT TAYLOR said so he might be, but this judgment had been obtained after the defendant had been told not to trouble himself. He consequently did not attend the court, and judgment was obtained behind his back for double the amount that was due even according to the plaintiff's own showing. There had clearly been a breach of faith on the part of the plaintiff or his clerk, and the rule to set aside the proceedings must be made absolute, with costs of defendant's attorney.

Bell v. Cassell.

The absurdity of the law as to vicious dogs.

The plaintiff, a labourer, claimed damages for having been bitten by the defendant's dog. The only evidence was that of the plaintiff himself, who said he was passing near defendant's house with a sack of coals on his back when the dog flew at him and bit him.

Mr. PITT TAYLOR said unless the case could be carried further there must be a nonsuit.

Mr. Rigby, plaintiff's attorney, said he had no more evidence.

Mr. PITT TAYLOR asked the plaintiff whether he had seen the defendant, who had not appeared to the summons.

The plaintiff said he had called on the defendant to ask for compensation, when he said that some time ago a sweep had kicked the dog and it had always bitten sweeps ever since when it had an opportunity. He supposed it had taken plaintiff for a sweep.

Mr. PITT TAYLOR said that evidence completely altered the case. The defendant knew his dog was a vicious one, and he was therefore liable, and the judgment must be for the plaintiff. He (Mr. Taylor) could not, however, allow the opportunity to pass without saying that the law on the subject was stupidly absurd. There was a different law in each of the three kingdoms, and it was equally absurd in each. In England, if your dog worries a sheep you are liable irrespective of whether the dog is known to be vicious or not, but if it worries a human being you are only liable if the dog can be shown to be known to you as a vicious dog, or that it has bitten human kind before. Thus there was more protection for a sheep than for a man. He hoped the Legislature would be moved to destroy the anomaly.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

VERITAS.—The subject referred to in the papers lately forwarded by you, does not call for any notice in our columns. The other topics adverted to in your last communication will be dealt with in due course. Your letter has been forwarded.

Mr. Watkin's second letter is in type, but press of matter obliges us to postpone it until another week.

Sir,—Perhaps some of your readers will kindly answer me the following questions.

1. Can a solicitor, admitted say in 1866, obtain a commission to administer oaths in the Court of Probate, without difficulty? If so what would be about the expense?

2. If a solicitor with such a commission, acting as managing clerk to a firm of solicitors, were to administer the oaths in a case in which probate was to be extracted by his employers, would the Registrar be justified in refusing to accept the affidavits so taken, what would be the result?

3. A. agrees to purchase two distinct properties for one sum of money. A separate abstract is delivered for each property, showing a totally different title. In the absence of stipulation to the contrary, can A. insist on having the properties conveyed to him by separate deeds, without paying the additional costs which would thus be incurred by the vendor.

A SOLICITOR.

SUGGESTIONS.

Sir,—Oblige me by the publication of the enclosed suggestions to the Lord Chancellor. These will, as I hope, be useful.

J. CULVERHOUSE.

1. That the formal part of the bill by way of petition be henceforth unnecessary, and that it shall simply contain a concise statement of the circumstances relied upon in support of the claim or case for relief, and that no prayer shall be necessary, nor a statement of the defendant's names at the foot of the bill.

2. Unless a demurrer shall be put in within ten days, or the time for so doing shall be enlarged by a judge in chambers, the equity shall be taken to be admitted, and the Court shall, in default of a demurrer, have full jurisdiction for a decree.

3. All orders made by a judge in chambers shall be drawn up by his clerk, and shall not (except in cases of orders in original matters) require to be entered; and all orders so drawn up by the judge's clerk shall require to be served at

common law, and a fee of five shillings shall be allowed for copy and service accordingly.

LEGAL EDUCATION—PRACTICE.

Sir,—Referring to the letter by "An Articled Clerk" in last week's number, I beg to inform him that he is in error when he says that, by not inserting the words "as per Judge," in a consent to a summons for time, the costs of the attendance are lost; the difference is that the masters allow 3s. 4d. for an attendance on a summons, where a consent is given—6s. 8d. on an order appearing on the face of it to be made by a judge, and when the words "as per Judge" are added to the consent the judge's clerk, in drawing up the order, takes care to leave out the words "by consent."

Thinking it important that the error should not remain uncontradicted I have troubled you with this letter.

J. A. ALSOP.

APPOINTMENTS.

The Hon. HENRY NEWTON, a puisne judge of the High Court of Bombay, has been appointed to act as Chief Justice of that Court, during the absence of Sir Richard Couch on leave. Mr. Newton is a member of the Bombay Civil Service, and was appointed a judge of the Bombay High Court in August 1862.

Mr. J. O'LEARY, First Judge of the Court of Small Causes at Bombay, has been appointed Government Professor of Law in that university, *vice* Mr. T. C. Haylar, who has resigned on proceeding to practise at the bar at Hong Kong.

Mr. CHARLES MANN CORNWALLIS WHATMAN, of Salisbury, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer oaths in Chancery.

Mr. RICHARD CHILD HEATH, of Warwick, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer oaths in Chancery.

Mr. SHAPLAND MORRIS TANDY, of Dublin, has been appointed a Dublin Commissioner to administer oaths in Chancery.

Mr. SYDENHAM DAVIS, of Dublin, has been appointed a Dublin Commissioner to administer oaths in Chancery.

Mr. WILLIAM FRY, of Dublin, has been appointed a Dublin Commissioner to administer oaths in Chancery.

Mr. WILLIAM STUART WALKER, an advocate at the Scottish Bar, has been appointed a member of the Board of Supervision for the Relief of the Poor in Scotland, in the room of the Right Hon. Sir John McNeill, G.C.B., resigned. Mr. Walker became a member of the Scottish Faculty of Advocates in 1840, and has for many years been secretary to the Board of Supervision, of which he has now become a member.

Mr. JOHN SKELTON, an advocate of the Scottish Bar, has been appointed Secretary to the Board of Supervision for the Relief of the Poor in Scotland, succeeding Mr. W. S. Walker, who has resigned the secretaryship on being appointed a member of the Board. Mr. Skelton was educated at the University of Edinburgh, and became an advocate in 1854.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

March 20.—*Regulation of Railways Bill*.—The Duke of Richmond moved the second reading of this bill. After explaining the provisions of the bill, he said he had thought it best, at the risk of the blame attaching to bringing in a small measure, to introduce a bill which should be practical in its nature and should deal with the more salient grievances.

Lord Redesdale thought the bill would be generally useful, but without the schedule it would be difficult to form an opinion as to the accounts. There should be one common form of accounts, and the bill should contain a provision that no securities given by the directors should be legal unless registered. The accounts should show every security, and also the floating debt. The proposed audit would be beneficial, but the 5th clause was at variance with the ordinary rule of law that the *onus* of proof does not lie on the accused. The provision in clause 12 in case of a difference of opinion among the auditors should be imperative instead

of permissive. Communication between passengers and guards should also be insisted on, and some particular mode prescribed by the Board of Trade. He also recommended the abolition of proxies at meetings.

Earl Grey, without regarding the bill as complete, approved the discretion which had introduced in the first instance a moderate measure. The audit of account required immediate attention: he himself had formerly advocated a better system, but the railway interest in the other House had been too strong. He gave a general approval to the bill so far as it went, and commented on the want of a proper tribunal to consider applications for railway schemes.

The Marquis of Clanricarde thought the bill might be of some use, but not much, and that the railway question should be left, not to the Board of Trade, but to a special tribunal, as in other countries.

Lord Westbury said the whole source of the uncertainty, confusion, and deception in the affairs of railway companies was the practice of keeping the capital account open. The result of the clause in the present bill relating to accounts would be that the capital account would never be closed. If such a clause were passed, Parliament ought to do what should have been done originally—namely, lay down some rule for the due apportionment of the expenditure between capital and revenue. There were many items of expenditure which should be apportioned partly to capital and partly to revenue. Perhaps the wisest way would be to close the capital account altogether, but if it were kept open it would be necessary that some rule should be laid down, and it might be well to provide some sinking fund out of revenue to meet the expenditure charged to capital. He trusted the noble duke would neither limit the form of account too much, nor, on the other hand, make it so large that the eye could not follow or the mind comprehend it. It ought to contain only such items as would state clearly what was the amount of the debt of the year, and also of the antecedent year which had not been paid. It would please him very much if that nondescript species of security called "Lloyds' bonds" were struck at by the bill. He did not say they were illegal, but they were a most fruitful means of deception and concealment in the affairs of railway companies. He should be happy to lend any assistance in his power to the noble duke in making the bill complete and efficient.

The bill was read a second time.

March 23.—*Bankruptcy Law Amendments*.—Lord Cairns moved the second reading of the Bankruptcy Acts Repeal Bill, the Bankruptcy Bill, and the Judgment Debtors Bill. After detailing the history of the subject since 1849, he recounted the main provisions of the present Bankruptcy Bill. He dwelt particularly on the subject of imprisonment for debt, which, in the main, the bill abolishes—imprisonment by county court committal—the Scotch system of trusts in bankruptcy—discharge of bankrupts—composition deeds—and the provisions of the bill as to courts of bankruptcy.

Lord Westbury dwelt on the evils of the present law of bankruptcy and winding-up joint-stock companies. He rejoiced to see acknowledged the inexpediency of imprisonment for debt, and dwelt on the hardship of the county court system in this respect. A thoroughly competent bankruptcy tribunal was absolutely necessary; he attributed the unsatisfactory working of the provisions of the Act of 1861 to the rejection of the proposal for a chief judge.

Lord Romilly did not think the bill would prove satisfactory.

The bill was then read a second time.

March 24.—The Poor Relief Bill was read a second time.

March 25.—*The Compulsory Church-rates Abolition Bill* was read a first time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

March 20.—*The Law of Expatriation*.—Mr. W. E. Forster called attention to this subject and recommended that some arrangement should be come to with foreign countries for giving to emigrants the "right of expatriation," on certain conditions, and also the right of resuming their original allegiance (repatriation); he recommended a joint commission appointed by England and the United States.

Sir R. Collier also considered that when a man had gone to a foreign country and given unmistakable signs of his intention of settling there, he should no longer be considered a British subject, though he might, on returning, be permitted to resume his allegiance on certain conditions.

Lord Stanley also considered that the doctrine of inde-

structible natural allegiance, as regards emigrants, was hardly defensible in theory, and unworkable in practice. The British Minister at Washington had been directed to express to the government of the United States that the British Government were willing to take the whole question into consideration. The political difficulties were small, but there were many legal difficulties connected with the succession of property and other analogous points. Before anything could be done an inquiry by competent legal authorities would be necessary; the details of effecting the desired object would, he trusted, be left to the Government.

Mr. Buxton recommended periodical international councils for dealing with these and similar questions.

Sir R. Palmer pointed out that there had been some misunderstanding on this subject. In construing general words in legislation of a particular nature, they were always understood as applying solely to those persons and things which were properly and *de jure* the objects of the Legislature. Then the 4 Geo. 2 and 13 Geo. 3 were intended merely to confer benefits, and not to impose burdens on the foreign-born children and grandchildren of natural-born British subjects. Again, all British subjects, while in a foreign country, were subject to its laws, and the American Government, on their taking the oath of allegiance, had a right to treat them just as natural-born American subjects; this was perfectly consistent with the right of England to impose on them the obligations of allegiance upon their return here. There was not, he thought, such a great conflict between our law and that of other countries on this subject. He distinguished between forfeiture of the burdens and the privileges of citizenship, and believed that in no case did the law of any nation allow a man to put off his allegiance at will, act as an enemy to his sovereign, and then return home and excuse himself on the ground that he had changed his nationality. He thought our law went rather too far in treating the British-born children of foreign parents, merely passing through this country, as British subjects. An alteration might be made as to emigrants intending to remain permanently abroad, but such persons should resume the burden of allegiance on returning to this country.

After some remarks by the Attorney-General, on the difficulties of the question, the subject dropped.

The Court of Appeal Chancery (*Despatch of Business*) Bill was read a second time.

The Compulsory Church-rates Abolition Bill was read a third time and passed.

March 23.—*The Representation of the People (Scotland) Bill* was read a second time.

March 24.—*Private Bill Legislation*.—On the further consideration of Mr. Dodson's motion to repeal standing order No. 131 (competition to be a ground of *locus standi*),

Mr. Leeman approved the motion.

Mr. Cave thought that in future competition would be reduced by amalgamations and arrangements, but considered that amalgamation schemes, as savouring of monopoly-creation, should be carefully scrutinized.

The motion was ultimately withdrawn.

The Licensing System.—Mr. Marsh called the attention of the House to this subject, but did not press his motion to a division.

The Compulsory Church-rates Abolition Bill.—The third reading was carried by a majority of 131 to 28.

March 26.—*The Bribery Bill*.—In committee on this bill Mr. Mitchell moved a resolution in favour of the retention by the House of the jurisdiction over controverted elections, and recommended a scheme by which two eminent members of the House, assisted by legal assessors, should try all petitions on the spot.

Mr. Whitbread supported the bill in preference to such a scheme, which would restore the evils dealt with by the Grenville Act. At this day the House could not interfere with the reports of election committees, and the Court of Bankruptcy had jurisdiction to decide on the *status* of its members.

Sir G. Bowyer thought that the jurisdiction of the House did not date farther back than the reign of Elizabeth. It was now of little importance; two judges could not do the work, and he preferred Special Commissioners, to be appointed by the Crown.

Mr. H. Berkeley said nothing would do but the ballot.

Sir S. Northcote said no improvement could be made unless the House would part with its imaginary privilege.

Mr. John Stuart Mill said that there ought to be an in-

quiry after every election by competent persons. The worst cases of bribery were often those in which there was no petition. The scrutiny should be extended to municipal elections.

Progress was ultimately reported.

The Ecclesiastical Commissioners Orders in Council Bill was read a second time.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the Law Institution, on Tuesday last, the following question was discussed:—"An estate is limited to A. for life, remainder to his first and other sons in succession in tail, remainder to B. in fee. Is B. entitled to a large quantity of timber blown down by a storm, before any son of A. has been born?" *Bateman v. Hotchkiss*, 22 L. J. N. S. Ch. 6; *Lushington v. Boldero*, 21 L. J. N. S. Ch. 49; *Bagot v. Bagot*, 32 Beav. 509. The debate was opened in the affirmative by Mr. Hunter, but on a division the question was decided in the negative.

ARTICLED CLERKS' SOCIETY.

At a meeting of this society, held in Clement's-inn Hall, on Wednesday evening, 26th inst., with Mr. Woodall in the chair, it was moved by Mr. Fraser—"That members of the Bar should have the exclusive right of addressing the Superior Courts of Law at Westminster and the High Court of Chancery."

After a very animated discussion the motion was lost by a majority of one.

COURT PAPERS.

CHANCERY VACATION NOTICE.

March 24, 1868.

During the Easter Vacation, 1868, all applications which are of an urgent nature are to be made to or at the chambers of the Vice-Chancellor Sir Richard Malins.

All applications *ex parte* are to be sent to the Vice-Chancellor Malins by book post, or parcel, prepaid, accompanied with the brief of counsel, endorsed with the terms of the order applied for, and an envelope capable of receiving the papers to be returned, with sufficient stamps affixed thereon, and addressed as follows:—"To the Registrar in Vacation, Registrar's Office, Chancery Lane, London, W.C."

On application for injunctions or writs of *ne exeat regno*, there must be sent, in addition to the above, a copy of bill, a certificate of bill filed, and office copies of the affidavits in support of the application.

The papers sent to the Vice-Chancellor with any order his Honour may make thereon will be returned direct to the registrar.

All applications for leave to give notice of motion only may be made to the chief clerk at chambers.

The Vice-Chancellor's address can be obtained at his Honour's chambers, No. 3, Stone-buildings, Lincoln's-inn.

The chambers of the Vice-Chancellor Malins will be open on the following days, viz: the 31st March and the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 7th, and 8th April, 1868, from eleven till one o'clock.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

ENGLISH FUNDS AND RAILWAY STOCK.

LAST QUOTATION, March 27, 1868.

(From the Official List of the actual business transacted.)

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 93
Ditto for Account, April 2, 93½
3 per Cent. Reduced, 92
New 3 per Cent., 92
Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94
Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94 75
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan. '72
Annuities, Jan. '80 —

Annuities, April, '95
Do. (Red Sea T.), Aug. 1898 20½
Ex Billa, £1000, per Ct. 7 p m
Ditto, £500, Do 18 p m
Ditto, £100 & £500, 15 p m
Bank of England Stock, 94 ½ per
Ct. (last half-year)
Ditto for Account,

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

India Stk., 104 p Ct. Apr. 74,
Ditto for Account
Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '80 118½
Ditto for Account, —
Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88 100½
Ditto, ditto, Certificates, —
Ditto Enhanced Ppr., 4 per Cent. 88

Ind. Inf. Pr., 5 p Ct. Jan. '73
Ditto, 5½ per Cent., May, '73, 109½
Ditto Debentures, per Cent.,
April, '64 —
Do. Do. 5 per Cent., Aug. '73 103½
Do. Bonds, 5 per Ct., £1000, 98 p m
Ditto, ditto, under £1000, — p m

RAILWAY STOCK.

Shires.	Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price
Stock	Bristol and Exeter	100	83
Stock	Caledonian	100	76 x u
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	103
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	37½
Stock	Do., East Anglian Stock, No. 2	100	7½
Stock	Great Northern	100	100½
Stock	Do., A Stock	100	100
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	96
Stock	Great Western—Original	100	47½
Stock	Do., West Midland—Oxford	100	30
Stock	Do., do.—Newport	100	30
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	125½
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	50
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	18½
Stock	London and North-Western	100	114½
Stock	London and South-Western	100	87
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	43½
Stock	Metropolitan	100	114½
Stock	Midland	100	100½
Stock	Do., Birmingham and Derby	100	76
Stock	North British	100	34
Stock	North London	100	116
10	Do., 1866	7½	8½
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	58
Stock	South Devon	100	45
Stock	South-Eastern	100	72½
Stock	Taff Vale	100	144

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The apprehension of a general election, or some other reason, caused the week to open with considerable dullness in the funds, and also in the railway and share markets, and foreign securities. As the week advanced a little activity became manifest, foreign securities, though quiet, showed some firmness, and the funds, following suit a little later, began to show signs of improvement, while the railway market experienced some fluctuation. The markets are generally, however, rather inactive, the funds being especially devoid of movement. The principal event in the railway market has been the report of the Caledonian Railway Company and the declaration of a 2½ per cent. dividend as against 6½ per cent. last year.

The issue of promissory notes to the creditors in Overend, Gurney, & Co., has been sanctioned by the Court of Chancery; by this means a further call this year is to be obviated.

The Foreign and Colonial Government Trust engrosses considerable attention. The trustees are to be Lord Westbury, Lord Eustace Cecil, and Mr. Sandford, M.P., and Messrs. G. W. Currie and Philip Rose; it appears, however, to us, that the advantage accruing to the subscribers from the connection with the scheme of these undoubtedly good names, may be overrated. The trustees of a public undertaking usually do little more than allow the property of the concern to stand in their names, the responsibility being with the managers. The main principle of the scheme is the security of dividing one's investment into many portions, and embarking each in a different venture, a mode of investment which, as regards foreign and colonial securities, is not at the disposal of small investors, however reluctant they may feel to trust all their venture to one bottom. Where, as in this scheme, a number of different investments is made, a compensating principle is introduced, the large dividend on one venture making up for the small dividend, or the no dividend on another. But it must not be overlooked that the resultant dividend, being an average dividend, cannot be expected to be high.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE MART.

March 19.—By Messrs. SOWDON & DURRANT.

Freehold plot of garden ground, fronting Meeting House lane, Peckham—Sold for £90.

By Messrs. FULLER & MARR.

Leasehold, two houses, Nos. 22 & 23, Stanford-road, King's-road, Chelsea; annual value, £30 each; term, 99 years from 1859, at £5 per annum—Sold for £425.

Leasehold house and shop, No. 3, Stanford-terrace, Chelsea; annual value, £45; term, 84 years unexpired, at £3 per annum—Sold for £460.

By Messrs. ST. QUININ & NOTLEY.

Leaseholds, four residences, Nos. 9 to 12, Keith-road, Acton-road, Shepherd's-bush; term, 99 years from Sept., 1867, at £10 per annum—Sold for £890.

AT THE GREYHOUND HOTEL, RICHMOND.

By Messrs. GREEN & SON.

Freehold corner plot of building land, having a frontage of 30 feet by a depth of 77 feet to the New Road, East Sheen—Sold for £90.
Freehold plot of building land, with frontage to the New-road, 40 feet by 77 feet—Sold for £65.

Freehold plot of building land, with frontage to the New-road, 40 feet by 77 feet—Sold for £60.
Freehold plot of building land, with frontage to the New-road, 40 feet by 77 feet—Sold for £60.
Freehold plot of building land, with frontage to the New-road, 40 feet by 77 feet—Sold for £60.
Freehold plot of building land, with frontage to the New-road, 42 feet by 80 feet 10 inches—Sold for £70.
Freehold plot of building land, with frontage to Upper Sheen-road, 42 feet by 112 feet—Sold for £95.
Freehold plot of building land, with frontage to Upper Sheen-road, 42 feet by 105 feet 6 inches—Sold for £96.
Freehold plot of building land, with frontage to Upper Sheen-road, 42 feet by 105 feet 6 inches—Sold for £95.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

COZENS-HARDY—On March 26, at 48, Clarendon-rd, Notting-hill, the wife of Herbert H. Cozens-Hardy, Esq., of a son.
MOSS—On March 21, at Zetland Lodge, New-cross, the wife of John Thomas Moss, Esq., Solicitor, of 38, Gracechurch-street, of a son.
WARNER—On March 24, at 3, Clifton-terrace, Winchester, the wife of Frederick J. Warner, Esq., Solicitor, of a son.

MARRIAGE.

LITTLEWOOD—CRAVEN—On March 21, at St. George's, Hanover-square, Henry Bucknall, son of the late Thomas Godden Littlewood, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn-fields, to Alice, widow of the late Charles Dacre Craven, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of Lincoln's-inn.

DEATHS.

BEAVAN—On March 23, at Hampstead, Margaret Helen, the wife of Edward Beavan, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, aged 35.
COVERDALE—On March 21, at 9, Somers-place, Hyde-park, John Coverdale, Esq., of No. 4, Bedford-row, Gray's-inn, aged 79.
EDWARDS—On March 24, at his residence, The Chase, King's Lynn, Henry Edwards, Esq., Solicitor, aged 49.
KING—On March 12, at No. 19, Camden-square, Camden-town, Elizabeth, the wife of Samuel King, Esq., Solicitor.
SOUTHAM—On March 22, at Reabrook View, Shrewsbury, Samuel Phillips Southam, Esq., late Solicitor, of Cleobury Mortimer, and for upwards of 40 years one of the Coroners for the county of Salop, aged 73.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Winding-up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, March 20, 1868.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Towyn Gas Lighting and Coal and Coke Company (Limited).—The Master of the Rolls has, by an order dated Feb 28, appointed William Robt Williams, Dolgelly, Merioneth, to be official liquidator.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

TUESDAY, March 24, 1868.

Gas Light Improvement Company (Limited).—Creditors are required, on or before April 27, to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Arthur Cooper, 13, George st, Mansion house. Friday May 8 at 12 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.
Palmer's Shipbuilding and Iron Company (Limited and Reduced).—Creditors on or prior to March 7, are required, on or before April 15, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr. Charles Child, Secretary, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Park-lane Company (Limited and Reduced).—Creditors on or prior to Feb. 28, are, on or before April 7, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims. Friday, April 17, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

TUESDAY, March 24, 1868.

Leeds Philanthropic Society, Fox and Grapes Inn, Kirkgate, Leeds, York. March 17.
Lord Townshend Widow and Orphan Friendly Society, Old Red Lion Inn, Bole Bridge-st, Tamworth, Stafford. March 18.
Loyal Westonbury Lodge, New-inn, Farnbridge, Hereford. March 20.
Protection Friendly Society, Wellington-inn, Newmarket, St. Mary, Suffolk. March 20.
Star of Gravesend United Ancient Order of Druids, Star Hotel, Parrock-st, Milton-next-Gravesend, Kent. March 19.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, March 20, 1868.

Brown, Thos Fras, Lincoln, Solicitor. April 15. Brown v Brown, V.C. Giffard.
Dodman, Montague, Thornham, Norfolk, Farmer. April 8. Dodman v Dodman, V.C. Stuart.
Gaunt, Joseph Naylor, Wotley, nr Leeds, Woollen Manufacturer. April 30. Holroyd v Gaunt, V.C. Stuart.
Hayward, Wm, Wimbourne, Stafford, Farmer. April 20. Booth v Blewitt, M. R.
Houlding, John, Battersea, Gent. April 11. Cross v Houlding, V.C. Malins.
Jones, Thos, Bristol, Silk Mercer. April 22. Jones v Jones, V.C. Malins.
Matthews, Thos Gadd, Bristol, Dry Salter. April 19. Matthews v James, M. R.
McKean, Wm, Brook st, Hanover-sq, Esq. April 11. McKean v Gladstone, V.C. Giffard.
Newcomb, Robt Nicholas, Stamford, Lincoln. May 1. Todd-Newcomb v Pulling, V.C. Stuart.

Philbey, Thos, Tring, Herts, Butcher. April 5. Philbey & Williams, V.C. Malins.
Reay, John Geo, Wrothbury, Northumberland, Gent. April 15. Carter & Holt, V.C. Giffard.
Squire, Ann, Southfield, York, Spinster. April 11. Hutton & Marshall V.C. Malins.

TUESDAY, March 24, 1868.

Beal, John Edwd, Grease-st, Rathbone-pl, Saddler. April 18. Pugh & Beal, V.C. Malins.
Cartwright, Ambrose, Worthing, Sussex, Gent. April 22. Griffiths & Tribe, V.C. Malins.
Fry, Chas Edwd, Compton House, Somerset, Esq. July 1. Fry & Fry, V.C. Stuart.
Hardcastle, John, Surrey-sq, Kent-rd, Underwriter. April 20. Finlason & Matlock, M. R.
Hems, Wm, jun, Aldgate, Cutler. April 22. Ashbury & Hems, V.C. Malins.
Hook, John, Thornecombe, Dorset, Yeoman. April 20. Matthews & Fooks, V.C. Malins.
Langton, Robt, Chipping, Lancaster, Yeoman. April 18. Kenyon & Preston, V.C. Malins.
May, Catherine, Queen's-gate, Hyde Park, Widow. April 20. Osanne & Kennedy, V.C. Malins.
McWilliam, Geo, Wigan, Lancaster, Draper. April 18. McWilliam & McWilliam, V.C. Malins.
Noble, Hy, Gower-st, Bedford-sq. July 1. Noble & Noble, V.C. Malins.
Sands, Hastings David, Kennington-gate, Hyde-Park, Esq. April 30. Ellis & Sands, V.C. Stuart.
Summers, Daniel, Woodford, Northampton, Gent. April 15. Berry & Parsons, M.
Thomas, Wm Hy, New Brighton, Chester, Wine & Spirit Merchant. April 30. Whitehead & Thomas, County Palatine of Lancaster.
Woodall, Wm, Dudley, Worcester, Iron Merchant. April 22. Beasley & Wood, V.C. Stuart.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, March 20, 1868.

Arthur, Wm Stock, Bristol, Oil Merchant. May 15. King & Plummer, Bristol.
Boyd, Jas. Lpool, Master Mariner. April 13. Harvey & Co, Lpool.
Cosham, Thos Shadwell, Lewes, Esq. June 17. Neve & Co, Cranbrook.
Fenwick, Wm, Albert-ter, Richmond-rd, Dalston, Gent. April 30.
Stibbard & Beck, East India Avenue, Leadenhall-st.
Franco, Thos, Bolton-le-Moors. May 1. Taylor & Son.
Garret, Ann, Bath, Widow. April 27. Stone & Co, Bath.
Harrison, Thos, Draper, Abington Abbey Asylum, Northampton, Gent. May 1. Prideaux, Goldsmith's Hall.
Lague, Louis, College-hill, Wine Merchant. April 27. Cordwell, College-hill, Cannon-st.
Lawton, John, Old Cavendish-st, Gent. April 25. Deane & Chubb, South-sq, Gray's-inn.
Legg, Jabez, Stratford, Essex, Esq. June 1. Carpenters' Hall, London-wall.
Mackenzie, Wm Jackson, Surgeon to the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company. April 2. Miller & Smith, Watling-st.
Michael, Chas Cecil, Belgrave Mansions, Piccadilly. May 1. Cookson, Wainwright & Co, New-sq, Lincoln's-inn.
Overbury, Nathaniel, Gt James-st, Bedford-row, Solicitor. May 1. Western & Son, Gt James-st, Bedford-row.
Palmer, Jas, Portland-pl, Esq. June 1. Flower, Bedford-row.
Piper, Thos, Marlborough, Wilts, Lead Merchant. April 30. May, Russell-sq.
St Quintin, Edwd Hy, Thrope Hamlet, Norwich, Surgeon. May 30. Watson & Fraser, Norwich.
Reed, Thos, Sunderland, Durham, Brewer. May 1. Ransom & Son, Sunderland.
Reed, Eliz, Sunderland, Durham, Widow. May 1. Ransom & Son, Sunderland.
Sherwood, Abigail, Upper George-st, Bryanstone-sq, Spinster. April 30. Huff, Nicholas-lane, Lombard-st.
Shinkfield, Elis, Upper Thames-st. April 30. Smith, Winchester-bldgs, Gt Winchester-st.
Taswell, Geo Morris, Canterbury, Esq. May 1. Eyre & Co, John-st, Bedford-row.
Topper, Robt, Hamer Bottoms, nr Rochdale, Lancaster, Clogger. April 18. Buckley.
Wood, John Manly, Elm-st, Temple, Barrister-at-Law. April 15. Bolton & Hill, Elm-st, Temple.

TUESDAY, March 24, 1868.

Alder, Saml John, Exeter, Gent. April 23. Kempster, Lower Kennington-lane, Lambeth.
Bennett, Jas, Hadenway, Warwick, Gent. April 30. Jones & Son, Leicester.
Brodie, Alex, York-pl, Portman-sq, Esq. May 1. Lucas, Fenchurch-st.
Chapman, Elis, Bradford-on-Avon, Wilts, Draper. June 1. Stone & Sparks, Bradford-on-Avon.
Deverell, Wm, Ray Farm, Salop, Farmer. May 1. Marcy, Bewdloy.
Greenhalgh, Chas, St Katherine's-villas, New rd, Hammersmith. May 1. Harwood, Cannon-st.
Hidmoor, Joseph, Hillbeck, Westmoreland, Miller. April 6. Thompson, Appleby.
Jones, John, Gibson-sq, Islington, Gent. May 1. Redpath & Holdsworth, Bush-lane.
Lewis, John, Cardigan, Grocer. June 20. Evans, Cardigan.
Newton Jas, St John-st, Cork Cutter. April 30. Haycock, College-hill.
Bacwith, Chas Ernest, St John-st, Baker. April 20. Haycock, College-hill.
Hidford, Abraham, Belitha-villas, Barnsbury, Esq. June 24. May, Russell-sq.

Smith, Thos, Landringham-rd, Dalston, Gent. April 31. Haycock, College-hill.
Trustum, Wm, Isleworth, Gent. April 30. Haycock, College-hill.

Deeds registered pursuant to Bankruptcy Act, 1861.

FRIDAY, March 20, 1868.

Abbott, John Nelson, Jun, Gt Winchester-st, Merchant. Feb 21. Asst. Reg March 18.
Amson, Wm, Lpool, Tallow Chandler. Feb 19. Asst. Reg March 17.
Allen, Richd, Tottenhall, Stafford, Builder. March 17. Comp. Reg March 19.
Alexander, Lawrence Alex, Birm, Jeweller. Feb 21. Comp. Reg March 18.
Barfield, Edmund, Gt Yarmouth, Norfolk, Fishing Merchant. Feb 10. Comp. Reg March 18.
Baxter, Wm Instone, Stourbridge, Provision Dealer. March 9. Comp. Reg March 18.
Belski, Joseph Matthew, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Outfitter. Feb 27. Asst. Reg March 18.
Blackburn, Fredk, Leeds, Dyer. Feb 25. Asst. Reg March 18.
Blakiston, Geo Fredk, St Paul's-cottages, Charlton-lane, Charlton, Gent. Feb 28. Comp. Reg March 18.
Boulter, Edmund, Staines, Plumber. March 14. Comp. Reg March 19.
Brecknell, Noah, jun, Birm, Watchmaker. March 18. Comp. Reg March 19.
Burford, Geo, Cradley Heath, Stafford, Shoe Dealer. March 13. Comp. Reg March 20.
Burt, Robt Strong, Northampton, Draper. March 11. Comp. Reg March 19.
Bushbridge, Geo, East Malling, Kent, Paper Manufacturer. Feb 28. Comp. Reg March 19.
Chapman, Wm, York, Artist. March 7. Comp. Reg March 20.
Coombes, Lawrence, Bedworth, Warwick, Excise Officer. March 18. Comp. Reg March 20.
Cottrell, Alex Thompson, Norton, Durham, Forge Master. Feb 24. Comp. Reg March 17.
Coward, Wm, Preston, Lancaster, Tailor. March 3. Asst. Reg March 20.
Darke, Ann, Teignmouth, Devon, Baker. March 9. Asst. Reg March 18.
Davis, Edgar, Gainsborough-rd, Gordon-rd, Stoke Newington, Manager of Theatrical Performances. March 8. Comp. Reg March 19.
Dawson, Nicholas, Christ-st, Bromley, Middx, Clothier. Feb 19. Comp. Reg March 16.
Escudier, Stephen, Leicester-sq, Bayswater, Gent. Feb 28. Comp. Reg March 20.
Everson, Hy, Hay Green, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. March 12. Comp. Reg March 17.
Froggatt, Thos, High Thorne, York, Innkeeper. Feb 22. Asst. Reg March 19.
Funk, Nicholas, Newcastle-st, Whitechapel, Grocer. March 18. Comp. Reg March 17.
Greaves, Jas Whitfield, Lancaster, Tailor. March 3. Asst. Reg March 20.
Grenves, Alfred, Harrow-on-the-Hill, Government Clerk. March 16. Comp. Reg March 20.
Guarnario, Pietro, Huntingdon, Silversmith. Feb 25. Asst. Reg March 19.
Haddon, Saml Jas, Clower, Berks, Schoolmaster. March 13. Comp. Reg March 19.
Hancorn, Thos, Lydbrook, Gloucester, Innkeeper. March 7. Asst. Reg March 19.
Harrison, Hy, Litherland, Lancaster, Grocer. March 10. Comp. Reg March 18.
Hayhow, Wm, Prospect-pl, New rd, Hammersmith, Cheesemonger. March 17. Comp. Reg March 18.
Hewett, Marlow, Bucks, Draper. March 6. Comp. Reg March 19.
Hiday, Chas Wm, Lpool, Tailor. March 10. Comp. Reg March 19.
Hobson, John, Nantwich, Chester, Shoe Manufacturer. March 4. Asst. Reg March 18.
Hodgson, —, Bradford, York, Machine Maker. March 12. Asst. Reg March 18.
Holdaway, John, Alfred-pl, Bedford-row, Government Clerk. March 16. Comp. Reg March 20.
Honkins, Thos Wm, South-st, Greenwich, Dressing Case Maker. March 5. Comp. Reg March 18.
Hughes, Edwd, Lpool, Baker. Feb 25. Comp. Reg March 20.
Isaacs, Isaac, Tenter-st, Spitalfields, General Dealer. March 10. Comp. Reg March 16.
Jackson, Wm, Denbigh-st, Piccadilly, Butcher. Feb 26. Comp. Reg March 20.
Jepson, John, Lower Broughton, nr Manch, Comm Agent. Feb 29. Comp. Reg March 19.
Johnson, John, Blisdale, York, Innkeeper. March 3. Comp. Reg March 20.
Joseph, Michael, Birm, Wholesale Jeweller. March 17. Comp. Reg March 19.
Joyce, Medbury, Stratford-pl, Camden-Town, Timber Merchant. Feb 19. Comp. Reg March 18.
Lees, Edmund, Rochdale, Lancaster, Broker. March 16. Asst. Reg March 19.
Lees, Saml, Birkenhead, Chester, Grocer. March 13. Asst. Reg March 19.
Leon, Hy, Charles-pl, Hertford-rd, De Beauvoir Town, Dealer in Eau de Cologne. March 17. Comp. Reg March 19.
Levish, Robert, Salford, Lancaster, Greengrocer. March 5. Asst. Reg March 20.
Lever, Ellis, West Gorton, nr Manch, Tarpaulin Manufacturer. Feb 29. Asst. Reg March 20.
Laurent, Jacques, Gt Newport-st, Soho-sq, Hotel Keeper. March 16. Comp. Reg March 19.
Lawson, Jas, Jarrow, Durham, Beerseller. March 18. Comp. Reg March 19.
Lodge, Wm, Sheffield, Grocer. Feb 25. Comp. Reg March 18.
Macartney, David, Waverley-rd, Harrow-rd, Paddington, Coal Merchant. March 12. Comp. Reg March 20.

Martin, John, Clifton-st, Notting Hill. March 12. Comp. Reg March 19.
 Marston, Edwd, & Albert Geo Garrow, Texteth-park, Lpool, Ironmongers. March 13. Asst. Reg March 19.
 Miles, Chas, Douglas-pl, Queen's-rd, Bayswater, out of business. March 7. Comp. Reg March 17.
 Milled, Albert, Oakley-square, Chelsea, Share Dealer. March 16. Comp. Reg March 20.
 Moore, Edwd, Hawes, York, Draper. Feb 26. Comp. Reg March 20.
 Moore, Chas Hulse, Birkenhead, Chester, Watchmaker. March 5. Comp. Reg March 18.
 Newman, Philip, New-rd, Woolwich, Baker. Feb 25. Comp. Reg March 19.
 Oldfield, Hamor, & Enoch Oldfield, Netherton, York, Farmers. Feb 27. Asst. Reg March 18.
 Parker, Hy, Nuneaton, Warwick, Gasfitter. March 18. Comp. Reg March 19.
 Parkin, Wm Douglas, Malvern-ter, Kilburn, Gent. March 1. Comp. Reg March 20.
 Phillips, Morris, Tenby, Pembroke, Timber Merchant. March 3. Comp. Reg March 17.
 Pownall, Chas Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. March 9. Comp. Reg March 18.
 Riley, Michael, March, Tailor. March 17. Comp. Reg March 19.
 Robinson, Mildred Dalby, Leeds, Innkeeper. March 16. Comp. Reg March 19.
 Roston, Thos, Seething-lane, Corn Factor. March 2. Comp. Reg March 19.
 Russell, John, Beborough-gardens, Pimlico, Manager. Feb 20. Comp. Reg March 19.
 Sanderson, Wm, Whithy, York, Master Mariner. Feb 22. Asst. Reg March 19.
 Selden, Jas, King-st, Hammersmith, Ironmonger. March 10. Inspectorship. Reg March 19.
 Shadwell, Thos Martin, Woodstock-rd, Poplar, Engineer. March 18. Comp. Reg March 19.
 Siebe, Hy, Frith-st, Soho, Lithographer. March 11. Comp. Reg March 19.
 Slack, John Major, Darlaston, Stafford, Draper. Feb 29. Asst. Reg March 16.
 Smith, Thos, Hamlet-rd, Norwood, Agent. Feb 29. Comp. Reg March 17.
 Smith, Hy, Brighthouse, York, Grocer. March 5. Asst. Reg March 20.
 Somerville, Robt, New-st, Brompton, Cabinet Maker. March 16. Comp. Reg March 19.
 Surtree, Anthony, Bishopwearmouth, Durham, Grocer. March 7. Comp. Reg March 17.
 Swaby, Edmd, Leeds, Hop Merchant. Feb 26. Comp. Reg March 18.
 Thomas, Evan, Beaumaris, Anglesey, Draper. March 5. Asst. Reg March 20.
 Thompson, Jonah, Bolton, Lancaster, Joiner. March 7. Asst. Reg March 19.
 Thornhill, Thos, Stoke-upon-Trent, Stafford, Painter. Feb 28. Comp. Reg March 20.
 Thonid, Hy, sen, Upton-on-Severn, Worcester, Butcher. Feb 20. Asst. Reg March 11.
 Tye, John, Lincoln, Millwright. March 12. Comp. Reg March 18.
 Tyler, Jas, Worcester, Hop & Seed Merchant. Feb 29. Comp. Reg March 18.
 Vale, Wm, Birm, Pencil Case Manufacturer. March 14. Comp. Reg March 20.
 Walker, John, East Cowick, York, Wheelwright. Feb 20. Asst. Reg March 17.
 Watson, John, Mexbrough, York, Slater. Feb 20. Asst. Reg March 18.
 Whettingstall, Thos, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Hotel Waiter. March 14. Comp. Reg March 20.
 White, Thos, Exeter, Fly Proprietor. Feb 22. Asst. Reg March 19.
 Whitley, Wm Alfred, Lpool, Newspaper Proprietor. March 6. Comp. Reg March 19.
 Williams, Jas Russell, Sutton-st, York-rd, Lambeth, Gent. March 13. Comp. Reg March 17.
 Wilson, Jas Robt, Union-st, Southwark, Oilman. March 16. Comp. Reg March 20.
 Wordsworth, Forth Cullen, Trefgarne Hall, Pembroke, Clerk. Feb 18. Asst. Reg March 17.
 Wright, Thos, South Shields, Durham, Ale & Porter Merchant. Feb 21. Comp. Reg March 18.
 Wright, Wm, Davenport, Northampton, Railway Contractor. March 16. Comp. Reg March 20.
 Zachari, Morris, Bristol, Photographic Artist. March 16. Asst. Reg March 19.

TUESDAY, March 24, 1868.

Ashley, Hy, Lpool, Draper. March 9. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Atha, Benj, & John Atha, Hunslet, nr Leeds, Chamois Leather Manufacturers. March 7. Asst. Reg March 21.
 Atha, Benj, Hunslet, nr Leeds, Oil Manufacturer. March 9. Asst. Reg March 21.
 Austin, John, Stanley-st, Brompton, Credit Draper. Feb 28. Asst. Reg March 24.
 Bateman, Wm, Snodland, Kent, Grocer. Feb 27. Asst. Reg March 20.
 Bellamy, Saml Lowdridge, Newington-causeway, Chemist. March 13. Comp. Reg March 20.
 Bexfield, Geo Saml, Peabody-bldg, Commercial-st, Whitechapel, Wholesale Confectioner. March 20. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Eleksi, Chas, Swansea, Glamorgan, Outfitter. March 3. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Blayde, Robt, Chester, Hoeler. Feb 11. Asst. Reg March 21.
 Branson, John, Stoke-upon-Trent, Stafford, Grocer. Feb 20. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Borrett, Joseph, Ranelagh-rd, Westbourne-sq, Bootm ker. March 2. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Boulter, Geo Barnett, Brighton, Sussex, Wine Dealer. March 9. Comp. Reg March 21.

Bower, John Abigail, Barnham Westgate, Norfolk, Schoolmaster. March 20. Comp. Reg March 24.
 Brown, Wm, Gt Carter-lane, Merchant. March 3. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Budden, Edwd, & Robt Bevan, Jefferys-sq, St Mary Axe, Ship Owners. March 10. Inspectorship. Reg March 23.
 Chambers, Christopher, Elmore-st, Islington, Grocer. March 13. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Chittenden, Edwd, Hythe, Kent, Painter. Feb 24. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Cockerill, Silas, Rochdale, Lancaster, Machine Maker. March 2. Comp. Reg March 20.
 Cohen, Joseph, New-st, Wentworth-st, Spitalfields, Rag Merchant. March 14. Comp. Reg March 21.
 Collard, Nelson, sen, Canterbury, Corn Factor. March 14. Comp. Reg March 24.
 Cook, Richd, Hathersage, Derby, Needle Manufacturer. March 13. Inspectorship. Reg March 20.
 Cullingford, Fras, Gosport, Southampton, Linendraper. March 4. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Deane, Chas Maslen, Manningham, York, Surgeon. March 5. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Edwards, Wm Parker Sheridan, Southsea, Southampton, Clerk. March 10. Comp. Reg March 20.
 Fellows, Wm, Bilston, Stafford, Grocer. Feb 25. Asst. Reg March 20.
 Foster, Joseph, Fulwood-ron, Printer. Feb 29. Asst. Reg March 21.
 Fowie, Arthur Edwd, Eastbourne, Sussex, Watchmaker. Feb 24. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Francis, Thos, Les Bridge, Upper Clapton, Lime Merchant. March 20. Comp. Reg March 20.
 Frean, John Hender, Plymouth, Devon, Baker. March 2. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Freeland, John, Waldron, Sussex, Carpenter. Feb 22. Asst. Reg March 21.
 Funnell, Jas, Rottingdean, Sussex, Farmer. March 18. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Galli, Francisco, Connaught-ter, Edgware-rd, Decorator. March 2. Comp. Reg March 19.
 Gallimore, Wm, Stone, Stafford, Shopkeeper. Feb 26. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Gann, John, Whitstable, Kent, Mariner. March 14. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Goodrich, Joseph, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, Saddler. March 5. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Greeves, Hy, Norwich, Butcher. Feb 24. Asst. Reg March 19.
 Hall, Mary Ann, King's Norton, Worcester, Widow. March 19. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Hall, Joseph, Easington-lane, Durham, Innkeeper. Feb 26. Comp. Reg March 24.
 Harding, John Edmund, Bridge-st, Southwark, Hat Flush Importer. March 10. Comp. Reg March 24.
 Harrold, Chas Ferdinand, Richmond-cottages, Richmond-rd, Hackney, Provision Merchant. Feb 27. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Haworth, Geo, Raddcliffe, Lancaster, Cotton Spinner. Feb 26. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Huntington, Joseph, Goole, York, Grocer. March 2. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Jackson, Edwd, Gorton, Lancaster, Joiner. Feb 24. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Jarman, Geo, Oak-pl, Bridge-rd, Battersea, Draper. Feb 29. Comp. Reg March 21.
 Johnson, Christopher, South Shields, Durham, Butcher. March 21. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Keen, Chas, Park-st, Camden-town, Grocer. March 12. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Keer, Hy Joseph, Norwich, Boot Manufacturer. Feb 22. Comp. Reg March 20.
 Kirton, Wm, Branston, Lincoln, Malster. Feb 27. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Knight, Saml, Sittingbourne, Kent, Licensed Victualler. March 13. Comp. Reg March 24.
 Lauder, Robt, Stanhope-st, Hampstead-rd, Victualler. March 12. Comp. Reg March 24.
 Leete, Edwd Stokes, Newton-le-Willows, Lancaster, Surgeon. Feb 26. Asst. Reg March 21.
 Levy, Morris, Middlesbrough, York, Jeweller. Feb 29. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Levyson, Morris, Wentworth-st, Whitechapel, Clothier. March 13. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Lindau, Leopold Ferdinand, Ipswich, Suffolk, Assistant Schoolmaster. Feb 27. Comp. Reg March 21.
 Lulham, Thos Farkin, Hastings, Sussex, Boot Manufacturer. March 19. Comp. Reg March 24.
 McClymont, Gravin, Bradford, York, Draper. March 13. Comp. Reg March 24.
 McLaren, Fras, Bishop Auckland, Durham, Shoemaker. March 18. Comp. Reg March 24.
 Mitchell, Joseph, March, Ironmonger. March 16. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Moore, Joseph, Longton, Stafford, Dealer in Furniture. March 16. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Moore, Edwin, York, Artist. Feb 29. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Newcomb, Wm Robt, Stamford, Lincoln, Bookseller. Feb 25. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Newry, Wm, Birm, Engineer. Feb 26. Comp. Reg March 21.
 Ordish, Thos, Newgate-st, Photographic Paper Maker. Feb 24. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Osborne, Hy Wm, Birkenhead, Chester, Greengrocer. March 13. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Palmer, Wm Munton, & Robt Palmer, Leeds, Corn Miller. March 18. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Parker, Fredk, Somerford grove, Stoke Newington, Post Office Clerk. March 23. Comp. Reg March 24.
 Pitts, Robt Taylor, Gordon-rd, Stoke Newington, Commercial Traveller. March 21. Comp. Reg March 24.

Peters, Geo, Lewes, Sussex, Innkeeper. Feb 24. Comp. Reg March 21.
 Radcliffe, Richd, West Derby, Lancaster, Gent. March 3. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Rigby, Peter, Bolton, Lancaster, Joiner. March 10. Asst. Reg March 21.
 Rose, Hy, Birm, Leather Merchant. Feb 18. Asst. Reg March 24.
 Rowe, John Thos, Lpool, Ship Smith. Feb 26. Asst. Reg March 24.
 Rubini, Philip, Portland-rd, Notting-hill, Professor of Magic. March 10. Comp. Reg March 21.
 Sherratt, Robt Clement, Boscombe-gardens, Alpha-rd, Regent's-park, Gent. Feb 20. Comp. Reg March 20.
 Shields, Mathew, Wynnall-rd, Forest Hill, Contractor. March 9. Comp. Reg March 24.
 Skinner, John, & Richd Terrey Skinner, Tavistock, Devon, Merchant. March 7. Asst. Reg March 24.
 Smith, John, Lendenhall-st, Mechanical Engineer. Feb 14. Comp. Reg March 24.
 Stott, Allen Clayton, Cleekeaton, York, Grocer. March 5. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Sundell, Krisccher, Commercial-st, Spitalfields, Dealer in Glass Shades. March 10. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Taylor, Wm John, High-st, Wandsworth, Clothier. Feb 25. Comp. Reg March 21.
 Trivasse, Geo, Upper George-st, Edgware-rd, General Agent. March 20. Comp. Reg March 21.
 Turner, Hy, Dudley-grove, Paddington, Corn Dealer. March 21. Comp. Reg March 24.
 Turnham, Wm, Margaret-st, Clerkenwell, Journeyman Butcher. March 19. Comp. Reg March 21.
 Whitaker, Hy, York, Butcher. Feb 24. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Williams, Mary Jemima, Chatham, Kent, Butcher. March 12. Comp. Reg March 23.
 Wilson, Chas, & Wm Skelton, Whitby, York, Linen & Woollen Drapers. Feb 22. Asst. Reg March 21.
 Wilson, Richd, Leeds, Flax Spinner. Feb 27. Asst. Reg March 21.
 Wilson, Ann, Holme, Manich, Cab Proprietor. March 4. Asst. Reg March 23.
 Woolhouse, Eliz, Sheffield, Grocer. March 19. Comp. Reg March 23.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, March 13, 1868.
 To Surrender in London.

Ashdown, John Fairfoot, Campbell-rd, Bow, out of business. Feb March 18. Murray. April 11 at 11. Hicks, Orchard-st, Portman-sq.
 Collins, Hy, Piccadilly, Financial Agent. Feb March 17. Pepps. April 17 at 2. Sidney & Son, Finsbury Circus.
 Cooper, Thos, Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb March 4. April 6 at 1. Gorton, Fumival's-lane.
 Depree, Sophia Mary Ann, Lookington-rd, Battersea, out of employment. Feb March 13. Pepps. April 17 at 12. Popham, Basinghall-st.
 Talbot, Geo Hy Dyer, Havening-st, Commercial-rd East, out of business. Feb March 18. April 9 at 12. Finch, Northumberland-st, Charing-cross.
 Fox, Geo, Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb March 16. (for pau). Roche. April 9 at 1. Drake, Basinghall-st.
 Gray, David, Welbeck-st, Cavendish-sq, Attorney-at-Law. Feb March 17. April 8 at 12. Scarth, Welbeck-st, Cavendish-sq.
 Heyward, Chas Jas, Gravesend, Kent, Iron & Brass Founder. Feb March 17. Roche. April 9 at 12. Munns, Lewis, & Co, Old Jewry.
 Holt, John, Gravesend, Kent, Iron Founder. Feb March 18. Roche. April 9 at 12. Lewis & Co, Old Jewry.
 Horne, Geo, Regent-st, Clerk. Feb March 16. Pepps. April 17 at 2. Davis, Hury-lane.
 Hughes, Saml, Gravesend, Kent, Iron Founder. Feb March 17. Roche. April 9 at 12. Lewis & Co, Old Jewry.
 Lumby, Brealey, Red Lion-st, Holborn, Saddler. Feb March 13. April 6 at 12. Elcum & Hooombe, Bedford-row.
 Manohoe, Daniel, Dalston-lane, Clerk. Feb March 18. Roche. April 9 at 12. Stockton & Jupp, Lendenhall-st.
 Middleton, Leonard Middleton, Maitland-pk-villas, Haverstock-hill, out of business. Feb March 16. April 6 at 1. Moss, Moorgate-st.
 Morris, Hy, St Mary's-hill, Berks, Builder. Feb March 18. Murray. April 1 at 11. Durrant, Guildhall-chmbrs.
 Perrin, Goodden, & Richd Goodden, Perrin, Lime-villas, Richmond-rd, Putney, Merchants. Feb March 16. Roche. April 9 at 12. Darville, Pancras-lane.
 Ranger, Wm, Northlan, nr Rye, Sussex, Builder. March 17. Roche. April 9 at 1. Deane & Chubb, Gray's-lane.
 Robinson, Geo, sen, Barnes, Surrey, out of business. Feb March 13. Pepps. April 17 at 1. Parsons, King William-st, Charing-cross.
 Russell, Thos, Camden-st, Camden-town, Draper's Assistant. Feb March 12. Roche. April 15 at 12. Perry, Guildhall-chmbrs.
 Spong, Wm, Surbiton-hill, Surrey, Greengrocer. Feb March 12. Pepps. April 17 at 12. Dobie, Basinghall-st.
 Staples, Wm, Knockholt, Kent, Labourer. Feb March 16. Pepps. April 17 at 2. Brown, Weavers-hill, Basinghall-st.
 Stevens, Alfred, Elizabeth-st, Port-rd, Bermondsey, Assistant to a Chemist. Feb March 16. Roche. April 9 at 12. Buchanan, Basinghall-st.
 Tennese, Angelina, Gerrard-st, Soho, no occupation. Feb March 13. April 6 at 12. Parsons, Strand.
 Wells, Walter, Stone, Kent, Builder. Feb March 17. Roche. April 9 at 11. Pittman, Guildhall-chmbrs.
 Willis, Joseph, Old Sampford, Essex, Baker. Feb March 18. Roche. April 9 at 1. Evans, John-st, Bedford-row.

To Surrender in the Country.

Adams, Wm, Whiteley, Cambridge, out of business. Feb March 16. Gachas, Peterborough, March 23 at 12. Deacon, Peterborough.
 Barry, John, Exeter, Bookseller. Feb March 19. Daw, Exeter, March 31 at 11. Flood, Exeter.
 Batten, Chas Wm, Bristol, Drayman. Feb March 13. Harley, Bristol, April 8 at 12. Roper.

Bellairs, Sarah Ann, & Jane Alice Benrose, Spalding, Lincoln, Stationers. Feb March 17. Tudor. Birm, March 31 at 11. Maples, Nottingham.
 Bembow, John Emery, Moldershall, Stafford, Journeyman Corn Miller. Feb March 16. Middleton. Stone, April 2 at 10. Temkinson, Burslem.
 Bottomley, Rusben, Rochdale, Lancaster, Cotton Spinner. Feb March 2. Harris. Manich, March 31 at 11. Roberts & Sons, Rochdale.
 Burton, Alfred, Bishop Wearmouth, Sunderland, Law Stationer. Feb March 10. Marshall. Sunderland, March 31 at 12. Bontham, Sunderland.
 Clegg, Fredk Albert, Rochdale, Lancaster, Chemist. Feb March 19. Harris. Manich, March 31 at 12. Standing, Rochdale.
 Celouagh, John, Llanelly, Potter. Feb March 14. Morris. March 30 at 11. Hess.
 Cordley, Wm, Weston Hills, Lincoln, Farmer. Feb March 18. Bonner. March 31 at 10. Percival, Spalding.
 Davies, Edwd, jun, Ellesmore Port, Chester, Soap Boiler. Feb March 16. Lpool, April 2 at 12. Cartwright, Chester.
 Eager, Geo, Lewes, Sussex, Grocer. Feb March 16. Blaker, Lewes. April 19 at 11. Hillman, Lewes.
 Facey, Wm, Appledore, Devon, Ship Owner. Feb March 18. Exeter March 31 at 11. Clarke, Exeter.
 Gay, Jarvis, Nottingham, Fruiterer. Feb March 17. Patchitt. Nottingham, April 8 at 10.30. Belk, Nottingham.
 Goodall, Jas, Wirswall, Chester Farmer. Feb March 13. Jones. Whitechurch, April 9 at 10. Clay, Whitechurch.
 Green, Bracebridge, Hetton, Rutland, Butcher. Feb March 16. Shield & Hough. Stamford, March 30 at 11. Law, Stamford.
 Hall, Herbert, Newark-upon-Trent, Nottingham, Nursery Seedman. Feb March 18. Newton. Newark, April 1 at 12. Ashley, Newark-upon-Trent.
 Helsdon, James, North Walsham, Norfolk, Waterman. Feb March 14. Wilkinson. North Walsham, April 2 at 11. Sadd, Norwich.
 Hodgetts, John, Stuston-wharf, nr Ledbury, Hereford, Timber Dealer. Feb March 17. Tudor. Birm, April 3 at 12. Hodson & Son, Birm.
 Holt, John Hy, Altrincham, Chester, Watch Maker. Feb March 16. Southern. Altrincham March 31 at 11. Brownwell, Altrincham.
 Hughes, Geo Griffiths, Prisoner for Debt, Lpool. Adj March 14. Walton. Lpool, April 2 at 11.
 Johns, John, Swansea, Glamorgan, Innkeeper. Feb March 16. Morgan. Neath, March 31 at 11. Plews, Merthyr Tydfil.
 Joiner, Jas Albert, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj Feb 19. Hime. March 31 at 3.
 Jones, Wm, Swansea, Glamorgan, Labourer. Feb March 10. Morris. Swansea, April 2 at 2. Morris, Swansea.
 Knowles, Eleazor, Thos Knowles, jun, & Benben Knowles, West-bromwich, Ironfounders. Feb March 16. Hill. Birm, April 1 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
 Ludwig, Lauber, Brighton, Sussex, Professor of German. Feb March 16. Everhead. Brighton, April 4 at 11. Mills, Brighton.
 Lawson, Wm, Keswick, Cumberland, Innkeeper. Feb March 13. Broatch. March 27 at 11. Ansell, Keswick.
 Lucas, Thos, Nottingham, Lace Maker. Feb March 16. Patchitt April 8 at 10.30. Cowley.
 Lynch, John, Halifax, York, Waiter. Feb March 19. Leeds, April 6 at 11. Thomas, Halifax.
 Marsden, Mary, Lpool, Victualler. Adj March 14. Lpool, April 2 at 11.
 Mathew, Jas, Bristol, Colt Breaker. Feb March 11. Harley. Bristol April 2 at 12. Clifton.
 Mills, Wm, Birm, Cost Master. Feb March 17. Hill. Birm, April 1 at 12. Webb, Birm.
 Muspratt, Chas Hurst, Gloucester, Wine Merchant, Feb March 17. Wilde. Bristol, April 1 at 11. Brotherton, Gloucester.
 Nassau, Geo, Knaresborough, York, Grocer. Feb March 13. Gill. Knaresborough, April 1 at 10. Dewes, Knaresborough.
 Newton, Benj, Dewsbury, York, Shopkeeper. Feb March 17. Nelson. Dewsbury, April 2 at 12. Oldroyd, Dewsbury.
 Oswin, Goodman, Sibley, Leicester, Hosier. Feb March 17. Brock March 31 at 11. Deane, Loughborough.
 Pelling, Eleazor, Newark-upon-Trent, Nottingham, Innkeeper. Feb March 3. Tudor. Birm, March 31 at 11. Waller, Newark-upon-Trent.
 Pearsall, Saml, Dudley, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Feb March 17. Walker. Dudley, April 2 at 12. Stokes, Dudley.
 Phillips, Saml, Swansea, Glamorgan, Licensed Victualler. Feb March 12. Morris. Swansea, April 2 at 2. Clifton, Swansea.
 Pritchard, Benj, Lpool, Builder. Feb March 2. Lpool, March 21 at 11. Best, Lpool.
 Farly, John, Walsall, Licensed Victualler. Feb March 17. Tudor. Birm, April 3 at 12. Southall & Nelson, Birm.
 Sanderson, Geo, Spalding, York, Farmer. Feb March 18. Stephen. Leeds, April 5 at 12. Hind, Howden.
 Sheldon, Wm Ward, High Royland, York, Innkeeper. Feb March 19. Leeds, April 6 at 11. Barratt, Wakefield.
 Shenton, Ann, Leicester, Slater. Feb March 18. Tudor. Birm, April 7 at 11. Harvey, Leicester.
 Stone, John, Woodbank, Chester, Farmer. Feb March 13. Porter. April 6 at 12. Dowham, Birkenhead.
 Sinsaght, Mrita, Lpool, out of business. Feb March 18. Hixie. Lpool, April 6 at 2. Henry, Lpool.
 Slater, Wm, Willenhall, Stafford, Blacksmith. Feb March 17. Brown. Wolverhampton, April 16 at 12. Ratcliffe, Wolverhampton.
 Smith, Fredk Hill, Worcester, Linendrapier. Feb March 17. Hill. Birm, April 1 at 12. Jagger, Birm.
 Smithurst, Wm, Cranford, Derby, Cordwainer. Feb March 16. Hubbersty. Wirksworth, March 25 at 11. Kingdon, Wirksworth.
 Spooner, Thos, Burton upon-Trent, Stafford, Land Agent. Feb March 18. Hill. Birm, April 1 at 12. Southall & Nelson, Birm.
 Symington, Andrew, Lpool, Grocer. Feb March 17. Hime. Lpool, March 31 at 3. Blackhurst, Lpool.
 Tatham, Wm Absalom, Saffron Walden, Essex, Limeburner. Feb March 14. Collin. Saffron Walden, March 30 at 2. Cardinal, Halstead.
 Thirman, Wm, Nottingham, Licensed Victualler. Feb Feb 5. Tudor. Birm, March 31 at 11. Maples, Nottingham.

Thomas, Theophilus, Abercarnid, Glamorgan, Grocer. Pet March 14.
 Russell, Merthyr Tydfil, April 3 at 12. Plews, Merthyr Tydfil.
 Todd, Mark, Blackburn, Lancaster, Book-keeper. Pet March 13.
 Bolton, Blackburn, April 2 at 11. Clough & Polding, Blackburn.
 Vaux, Wm, Durham, out of business. Pet March 14. Greenwell.
 Durham, April 2 at 11. Salkeld, Durham.
 Wheeler, Thos Greenhalgh, Eastleach Turville, Gloucester, Blacksmith.
 Pet March 13. Anderson. Northleach, March 30 at 10. Fowler &
 Co, Fairfield.
 Wray, Fras, Kingston-upon-Hull, Hairdresser. Adj March 11. Philip-
 pins. Kingston-upon-Hull, March 31 at 11.
 Wright, John, Marshside, Lancaster, Grocer. Pet March 16. Welshy.
 Ormskirke, April 1 at 10. Barker, Southport.

To Surrender in London.

TUESDAY, March 24, 1868.

Badger, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj March 20. Roche.
 April 29 at 11.
 Bell, John Hy, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj March 18. Roche.
 April 29 at 11.
 Bennett, Chas, Bowler, Prisoner for Debt, Surrey. Adj March 20.
 Roche. April 29 at 11.
 Bonney, Jas, Reigate, Surrey, Soda Water Manufacturer. Pet March
 16. April 8 at 12. Richards, Charing-Cross.
 Booker, Geo, Bridge-house, Lee-rd, Boot Maker. Pet March 20.
 Pepps. April 21 at 12. Daniels & Co, Fore-st.
 Brooks, Thos, Bishopsgate-st Within, Merchants. Pet March 20. April
 15 at 11. Worthington & Co, Milk-st.
 Cans, Jas Chas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet March 18 (for pau).
 April 11 at 11. Dobie, Basinghall-st.
 Collins, Thos, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj March 18. Roche. April
 29 at 11.
 D'Arcy, John Marshall, Cheapside, Hair Net Manufacturer. Pet
 March 21. Roche. April 15 at 12. Dubois & Maynard, Church-
 passage, Gresham-st.
 Evans, Wm, Frogmore-house, Wandsworth, Gardener. Pet March 18.
 Pepps. April 17 at 11. Haynes, Duke-st, Manchester-st.
 Gibbins, Wm, Beverley-rd, South Penge Park, Brickmaker. Pet
 March 17. Pepps. April 17 at 2. Dimsdale, Poultry.
 Hayman, Hy, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet March 20 (for pau).
 Brougham, April 15 at 12. Smith, Gresham-house, Old Broad-st.
 Izant, Wm Hy, Grosvenor-row, Pimlico, Electric Telegraph Manufac-
 turer. Pet March 18. Pepps. April 21 at 11. Merriman & Co,
 Queen-st.
 Jamieson, Geo, Davison, Colvestone-crescent, Dalston, Woollen Cloth
 Manufacturer. Pet March 20. Roche. April 15 at 12. Podmore,
 Union-court, Old Broad-st.
 Lee, Albert, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet March 20 (for pau).
 Pepps. April 21 at 1.
 Lowman, John Hy, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj March 18. Roche.
 April 29 at 11.
 Lugar, Chas Lucas, Mistle, Essex, Greengrocer. Pet March 20.
 Pepps. April 21 at 1. Jones, Colchester.
 Madden, Jas, L Cadwell-hall, Bookseller. Pet March 16. April 6 at 1.
 Darville, Fancras lane.
 Mann, Walker, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet March 18 (for pau).
 Pepps. April 21 at 11. Godfrey, High-st, Marylebone.
 Martin, Hy, Southampton, Tailor. Pet March 17. Pepps. April 17
 at 2. Mackay, Southampton.
 Mason, John Joseph, Gt College-st, Camden-town, out of business.
 Pet March 19. April 8 at 1. Beard, Basinghall-st.
 Monque, Chas Fras, Kingsland-rd, Saddler. Pet March 20. April 15
 at 11. Brighton, Bishopsgate-st Without.
 Neall, George, Gunnsbury-pl, Turnham-green-rd, out of employment.
 Pet March 19. April 8 at 1. Piskman, Guildhall-chambers.
 Pitcher, Hy, Sotheby, Oakley-st, Chelsea, Ship Builder. Pet March
 20. Roche. April 15 at 1. Strangways, Kings-rd, Gray's-inn-rd.
 Ralph, Thos Owen, Ripley-pl, Dingwall-rd, Croydon, Photographic
 Artist. Pet March 18. Pepps. April 21 at 11. Philp, Bucklers-
 bury.
 Seaman, Eliz Eglinton, Brighton, out of business. Pet March 19.
 Murray. April 11 at 12. Lovegrove, South-square, Gray's-inn.
 Thomas, Lewis, Dartmouth-rd, Blackheath, no occupation. Pet
 March 16. April 8 at 11. Ingle & Gooddy, King William-st.
 Thomas, Robt, Southampton-row, Russell-sq, Tool Maker. Pet March
 21. Roche. April 15 at 1. Greaves, Essex-st.
 Thompson, Edwin, Stratford, Essex, Clerk to an Architect. Pet March
 19. Murray. April 11 at 11. Bickley, Bouverie-st.
 Tonks, John Fras, Monkwell-st, Dealer in Silks. Pet March 18. April
 8 at 12. Solomon, Finsbury-pl.
 Waller, Edw Augustus, Grove-pl, Brixton-rd, Metal Merchant. Pet
 March 19. Pepps. April 21 at 11. Marsden, Walbrook.
 Walters, Wm, Kilburn-outtage, Kilburn, Inspecting Mail Guard.
 Pet March 21. Pepps. April 21 at 1. Thompson, Gray's-inn-sq.
 Warner, Geo Hy, Kerby-st, East India Dock-rd, Oilman. Pet March 19.
 Murray. April 11 at 11. Wood, Basinghall-st.
 Weir, John, Rose-villas, Wellington-rd, Stockwell, Clerk. Pet March
 16. Pepps. April 17 at 1. Doyle & Co, Verulam-bldgs, Gray's-inn.
 White, Wm English, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet March 20 (for pau).
 Roche. April 15 at 12. Hicks, Orchard-st, Portman-sq.
 Wiles, Josiah, St Neots, Huntingdon, Bootmaker. Pet March 19.
 Pepps. April 21 at 12. Doyle & Co, Verulam-bldgs, Gray's-inn.
 Wormsley, John, Prisoner for Debt, Surrey. Pet March 19 (for pau).
 Pepps. April 21 at 12. Watson, Basinghall-st.

To Surrender in the Country.

Bates, Jas, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Brick Dealer. Pet March 21.
 Hill. Birm. April 8 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
 Bakky, David Thornbury, Manch, Licensed Victualler. Pet March 19.
 Macras. Manch, April 3 at 12. Cooper & Co, Manch.
 Bram, Joshua, Everton, nr Lpool, Mourning Coach Proprietor. Pet
 March 21. Lpool, April 7 at 1. Eddy, Lpool.
 Blackwell, John, Sandbach, Chester, Salt Proprietor. Pet March 20.
 Lpool, April 7 at 12. Yates & Martin, Lpool.
 Borrow, Joseph, Devonport, Devon, Cooper. Pet March 20. Pearce.
 East Stonehouse, April 8 at 11. Beer & Rundle, Devonport.
 Froughall, Thos, Netherpton, Worcester, Charter Master. Pet March
 20. Walker. Dudley, April 9 at 12. Stokes, Dudley.

Brydon, Joseph, Heaton-le-Hole, Durham, Butcher. Pet March 16.
 Gibson. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, April 3 at 12. Harle & Co, New-
 castle-upon-Tyne.
 Chorley, Hannah, Kendal, Westmorland, Innkeeper. Pet March 13.
 Wilson. Kendal, April 2 at 10. Thomson, Kendal.
 Cole, Wm Fras, Prisoner for Debt, Durham. Adj March 18. Green-
 well. Durham, April 6 at 10. Barker, Sunderland.
 Courtney, Robt Lymham, Westbromwich, Stafford, Auctioneer. Pet
 March 19. Hill. Birm. April 8 at 12. Jackson, Westbromwich.
 Dainty, Richd, Dudley, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Pet March
 18. Walker. Dudley, April 9 at 12. Stokes, Dudley.
 Derbyshire, Geo, Dresden, Stafford, Builder. Pet March 16. Keary.
 Stoke-upon-Trent, April 4 at 11. Tennant, Hanley.
 Dickinson, Thos, Ighfield, Salop, Farmer. Pet March 19. Hill. Birm.
 April 8 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
 Forster, Jas, Manch, Comm Agent. Pet March 20. Harris. Manch.
 April 6 at 11. Simpson, Manch.
 Fry, John Rabbits, High-moor, Dorset, Carpenter. Pet March 31.
 Drutt, Christopher, April 4 at 3. Tanner, Wimborne Minster.
 Gardner, Wm, Birm, Fishmonger. Pet March 20. Guest. Birm.
 April 3 at 10. East, Birm.
 Green, Wm Hy, Glastonbury, Carpenter. Pet March 18. Lovell.
 Wells, April 4 at 12. Bulleid, Glastonbury.
 Guest, Thos, Manch, out of business. Pet March 20. Kay. Manch.
 April 6 at 9.30. Richardson, Manch.
 Hebron, Thos, Poulton, Hartlepool, Durham, Butcher's Assistant.
 Pet March 20. Child. Hartlepool, April 6 at 11. Strover, West
 Hartlepool.
 Hart, Isaac, Chester-le-Street, Durham, Grocer. Pet March 18.
 Greenwell. April 6 at 11. Marshall, sen, Durham.
 Hellwell, John, High-lane, nr Ridgway, Derby, Licensed Victualler.
 Pet March 20. Leeds, April 15 at 12. Fernald, Sheffield.
 Hobson, John, Nantwich, Chester, Boot Dealer. Pet March 12. Lpool,
 April 3 at 12. Eddy, Lpool.
 Johnson, John, Darlington, out of business. Pet March 18. Cowes.
 Darlington, April 3 at 11. Robinson, Darlington.
 Jones, Richd, Bridgnorth, Salop, Coal Merchant. Pet March 18.
 Bridgnorth, April 27 at 12. Batte, Bridgnorth.
 Kelly, John, Denton, Lancaster, Cabinet-maker. Pet March 19. Brooks.
 Hyde, April 8 at 11. Toy, Ashton-under-Lyne.
 Knight, Geo Brandell, Stogumber, Somerset, Tailor. Pet March 18.
 White. April 6 at 10. Trevor, Nether Stowey.
 Longley, Obadiah, & Jas Obadiah Longley, East Grinstead, Sussex,
 Farmer. Pet March 19. East Grinstead, April 2 at 11. Mills, Brighton.
 Maher, Jas, Bristol, Clothier. Pet March 17. Wilde, Bristol, April 3
 at 11. Press & Co, Bristol.
 Mancel, Thos, Chetwynd Aston, Salop, Wheelwright. Pet March 16.
 Liddle. Newport, April 9 at 9. Walker, Wellington.
 Miller, John, Sheffield, Paperhanger. Pet March 18. Wake. Sheffield.
 April 1 at 1. Micklethwaite, Sheffield.
 Morrison, Thos, Jarrow, Durham, out of business. Pet March 16. Wawn.
 South Shields, April 8 at 1. Mahaur, South Shields.
 Mortimer, Wilson, Leicester, Beerhouse-keeper. Pet March 20. Lei-
 ceaster, April 18 at 10. Owston, Leicester.
 Nicholson, Edward Pearson, Cumberland, Shaw-house, nr Alston, Joiner.
 Pet March 17. Varry. Feather, April 3 at 10. Arnison, Penrith.
 Oldham, John, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancaster, Builder. Pet March 12.
 Macras. Manch, April 9 at 11. Marsland & Addeshaw, Manch.
 Patchett, Geo, Eccleshill, York, Stonemason. Pet March 20. Bradford.
 April 3 at 9.15. Hill, Bradford.
 Prosser, Leopold, Birm, Importer of Watches. Pet March 12. Birm.
 April 8 at 12. Reece & Harris, Birm.
 Rowbottom, Thos, Messingham, Lincoln, Farmer. Pet March 19. Leeds.
 April 8 at 12. Carnochan, Crowle.
 Sheldon, Wm, Sheffield, Cab Proprietor. Pet March 20. Wake. Sheffield.
 April 6 at 1. Eyon, Sheffield.
 Shiley, Nathan, Wheatcroft, Nottingham. Pet March 19. Patchitt.
 Nottingham, April 8 at 10.30. Quarles, Nottingham.
 Smallhouse, Jas, Birm, Fish and Game Dealer. Pet March 19. Tudor.
 Birm, April 3 at 12. East, Birm.
 Smith, Isaac, Darlington, Durham, Spinning Overlooker. Pet March
 16. Bowes. Darlington, April 3 at 10. Robinson, Darlington.
 Stephenson, John Roberts, Monkwearmouth Shore, Durham, Painter.
 Pet March 19. Marshall. Sunderland, April 9 at 12. Marshall, Dur-
 ham.
 Storey, Isabella, Bishop Wearmouth, Durham, Hosier. Pet March 20.
 Marshall. Sunderland, April 9 at 12. Bell, Sunderland.
 Sullivan, Martin, Manch, Boot Dealer. Pet March 13. Harris. Manch.
 April 7 at 11. Jones, Manch.
 Thompson, Chas, Blackburn, Lancaster, Butcher. Pet March 19. Harris.
 Manch, April 8 at 12. Gardner, Manch.
 Trace, Thos, Exeter, Cattle Dealer. Pet March 21. Exeter, April 3 at
 12. Floud, Exeter.
 Tysan, Moses, Newbarns, Lancaster, Labourer. Pet March 19. Postle-
 thwaite. Ulverston, April 6 at 10. Jackson, Ulverston.
 Tyeon, Wm, Ambleside, Westmorland, Shoemaker. Pet March 18.
 Taylor. Ambleside, April 8 at 11. Nicholson, Ambleside.
 Vanstone, Robt, Swansco, Glamorgan, Licensed Victualler. Pet March
 21. Bristol, April 6 at 11. Clifton, Bristol.
 Wardley, Joshua, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj March 18. Liver-
 pool, April 3 at 11.
 Whitehouse, Edward, Brierley-hill, Stafford, Ale and Porter Dealer. Pet
 March 20. Tudor. Birm, April 3 at 12. Reece & Harris, Birm.
 Wilson, Wm, Wellington, Salop, Beerseller. Pet March 13. Newill.
 Wellington, April 22 at 11. Marcy, Wellington.
 Wilson, John, Nevin, Carnarvon, Draper. Pet March 20. Lpool, April
 8 at 11. Evans & Co, Lpool.
 Wright, Joseph, Lodge-lane, nr Lpool, Car Proprietor. Pet March
 21. Lpool, April 6 at 11. Smith, Lpool.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, March 20, 1868.

Dickson, John, Cadoxton Lodge, nr Nenth, Glamorgan, Railway Con-
 tractor. March 16.
 Ford, Jas, Margate, Kent, Tobacconist. March 13.
 Weston, John Hy, Kennington-rd, Lambeth, Chandeller Manufac-
 turer. March 19.
 Woodall, Robt, Irlams-o'-th'-Heigh, Lancaster. March 11.

